G. Musgrave.

G. Musgrave

Vol. 5.

SCC
1793

THE

CASE STATED,

Between the

CHURCH of *ROME*

AND THE

CHURCH of *ENGLAND*.

Wherein is Shewed,

That the *Doubt* and the *Danger* is in the Former, and the Certainty and Safety in the Latter *Communion*.

For their Rock is not as our Rock, even our Enemies themselves being Judges. Deut. xxxii. 31.

The Fifth Edition.

LONDON,

Printed for *George Strahan* at the *Golden Ball* over-against the *Royal Exchange*, *Cornhill*. 1714.

CONTENTS.

1. JERUSALEM *the Mother Church.* page 2
2. *Of the Supremacy of St.* Peter. 3
3 *Of the* Unity *of the* Church. 10
4. *Of New Articles of* Faith, *and of the* Sacraments. 17
5. *More Divisions in the Church of* Rome *than among Us.* 18
6. *The Communion of* Rome *the least part of the* Catholick Church. 19
7. *Of* General Councils. *And how the* Church *of* Rome *came to be called, first the* Latin, *and then the* Catholick Church. 21
8. *The* Infallibility *of* General Councils. 23
9. *Of the Promises of* Infallibility, *&c. made to the* Church. 26
10. *Of the* Infallibility *of the* Apostles. 32
11. *Of* Miracles *and the* Legends. 33
12. *The* Circle *of* Church *and* Scriptures. 35
Of God's being oblig'd to give us an Infallible *Guide.* 36
13. *None saved but by* Christ. 38
Yet this condemns not the Heathen. Ibid.
Our Advantage over them. 39
Of the Jews *and* Samaritans. 40
The Jews *had a stronger Plea than the Church of* Rome. 42
The great Defection *foretold.* 43
The Ch. of the Jews rejected their Messiah. 45

Christ *was not the Church.* 45
14. *Of* Private Judgment, *and the* Mysteries *of* Faith. 46
15. *Of the* Deists. 48
16. *Of* Authority *and* Evidence. 49
Of false Gospels, *&c.* 51
Of various Lections and Translations. 54
Of the French *Translations.* 55
17. *No Security to the* People *in the* Infallibility *of the* Church. 59
18. *Of a* Living Infallible Judge. *And the* Church *being reduced to one* Laick, *a* Woman, *or an* Infant. 60
19. *Of the* Deposing *Power.* 66
20. *Particularly in* France. 69
Oath of the Bishops *to the* Pope. 74
The Bulla in Cœna. 75
The Coronation *of the* Pope. ib.
Canonization of Pius *V.* ib.
21. *The* Confederacy *to stop the* Reformation *in* France 78
Of the Church *and* Court *of* Rome. 81
Of the Pope's Supremacy. 82
22. *Of* Excommunication. 83
Who is Judge? Makes the Pope *Absolute.* 84
Most of the Roman Catholicks, *and all their* Kings *are* Excommunicated *by the* Pope 85
23. *No outward Infallible Judge.* 87
Why Christ *not known to the* Church. 88
Why so few believed on Him at first. 89
An Infallible Guide *no Security, unless we were* Infallible *too.* 90

How

How the Angels, *and* Adam, *and the Seven* Churches *fell.* ib.
The Infallibility *the likelieſt means to bring on the* General Defection. 91
The Infallibility *not to be found. Four different* Schemes *of it.* 92
24. *The State of the* Creation. 95
Reaſon our Guide, with all its failings. 97
25. Rome *the Damning* Church; *yet the Learned among them allow the Salvability of* Proteſtants. 98
The Teſtimony of Queen Mary *of* Scotland. *And of King* James *II.* 100
26. *The* Roman Catholicks *of* England *kept Communion with Us after the* Reformation. 101
The Pope *made the Breach of Communion.* ib.
27. *Of the Words* Papiſt *and* Roman Catholick. 103
No Church *was ever* Catholick, *in the Senſe of the* Church *of* Rome. 103
Let her tell which was the Catholick Church *before* Rome *was* Chriſtian? ib.
28. *How the Church of* Rome *came by her Greatneſs.* 104
The Government of the Church *from the Beginning.* 105
The Deſperateneſs of ſome who would be Reconciled to Rome. 108
29. France *ſtill in the Dreggs of* Popery *as to* Doctrine *and* Worſhip. 109
30. *Of* Confeſſion. Opus Operatum, *and* Means *of* Grace. ibid.

The many Consecrations *of* Means *of* Grace *in the* Church *of* Rome. 111
Our Rites, *and* Ceremonies, *&c. no* Means *of* Grace. 112
31. *Invocation of* Saints, &c. 113
32. *The* Heathen *worshipped the true* God, *with Inferior* Gods, *as* Ministers *of His Kingdom.* 117
Suppositious Dæmons *and* Saints. 125
33. *The Worship of the Virgin* Mary. *And of the* Index Expurgatorius. 127
34. *Of* Reliques. 132
35. Images *of the* Saints. 133
The Honour we pay to the Saints. 134
36. *Images of* God. 136
37. Trans-substantiation. *Wherein of* Implicit *Faith.* 141
38. *The* Cross *worshipped with* Latria. *And the* Images *of* Christ. 160
39. *The* Præputium *of* Christ. *And parcels of his* Blood. 162
40. *Taking the* Cup *from the* Laity. And Marriage *from the* Clergy. 166
41. Purgatory. *Wherein of* Tradition. Supererogation. *Of Prayers for the* Dead. *And in an* Unknown Tongue. 179

CONCLUSION.

Of the Church *and her* Unity, *&c.* 192

Geo. W. Musgrave.

A

CONVERSATION

Betwixt an

Engliſh Roman Catholick Nobleman,

AND A

GENTLEMAN

His FRIEND of the

Church of *ENGLAND.*

Lord. IT is hard that by your late Act of Parliament I muſt either loſe my Eſtate or change my Religion.

Gentleman. I think your Lordſhip ought not to loſe your Eſtate, till you have firſt conſidered how far your Conſcience will allow you to Conform to what is required of you.

L. If I thought I could save my Soul in the Church of *England*, I would think my self obliged to preserve my Right and Posterity.

G. Pray, My Lord, what is there in the Communion of the Church of *England* should make you think your Soul in any Danger? Would there be any Hazard of your Soul if there were no Invocation of *Saints* that are Dead in the Publick Offices of the Church: No Pictures or Images of *God* to be seen there: No *Elevation* of the *Hoſt*, which was but of late Years brought into the Church: No Prayers for Souls out of *Purgatory*: If the Publick *Prayers* were in the *vulgar Tongue*: And if the *Sacrament* were given in *both Kinds*? For theſe are all the differences you will find betwixt your *Publick Offices* and ours.

L. But I muſt keep in the Communion of the *Church*, elſe I think I cannot ſave my Soul.

G. Your Lordſhip means in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*.

(1) *L.* Yes, for ſhe is the *Mother Church*, and Center of *Unity* to all other Churches, inſomuch that who are not of her Communion, are out of the Pale of the *Catholick Church*.

G. My Lord, it is certain that *Jeruſalem* was the *Mother Church*, where *Chriſt* firſt planted the Goſpel, and Commanded that it ſhould be thence propagated to all other Nations, as he himſelf ſaid, *beginning at Jeruſalem*, Luke

Luke xxiv. 47. And till after the Vision of the Sheet to St. *Peter*, Acts x. No *Gentile* was admitted, as it is said, *Acts* xi. 19. *They travelled——Preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only.* So that the *Jewish Christian Church* was the only *Church* for some time, and she it was who Converted the *Gentile* Nations, and therefore was the *Mother Church* to them all.

And *Rome* was not the first *Gentile* Church, for *the Disciples were called Christians first in Antioch*, Acts xi. 26. And the *Greek* Church was before the *Latin*; the New Testament was wrote in *Greek* for their Use, therefore the *Greek* Church could not be the Daughter of the *Latin* Church, which was born after her.

(2.) *L.* But St. *Peter* having been Bishop of *Rome*, and Christ having Constituted him to be the *Head* of the *Catholick Church* throughout the whole World, the same must descend to his Successors the Bishops of *Rome*.

G. This will not make her the *Mother* Church. You may call her *Supreme*, *Absolute*, *Universal*, or what you please, any thing but the *Mother* Church, to which it is impossible she should have any Title.

In the Conversion of the *Gentiles* to *Christianity* one Man and one Nation, must receive the Faith before another, they were not all Converted on a Day. And as when one Man Converts another, so it is of Churches and Nations,

Nations, it gives the one no Superiority over the other, except that of Gratitude and Eſteem, but nothing of Authority.

But whatever the Privilege of the Mother Church may be, if it can be Tranſlated from the *Mother* to the *Daughter*, from one Church to another, from *Jeruſalem* to *Antioch*, and thence to *Rome*, as you muſt be obliged to ſay; then it may be Tranſlated from *Rome* alſo to ſome other Church, unleſs ſome poſitive Command of *Chriſt* can be produced, firſt to fix it at *Rome*, and then a Promiſe that it ſhall never thence be removed. But the *Church of* Rome is not once named in all the New Teſtament, unleſs ſhe is meant by the *Church at Babylon*, 1 Pet. v. 13. Nor is there any Promiſe whatſoever made to her, or any the leaſt Intimation of her being the *Head* of the *Churches*, the Standard and Center of *Unity* to them all. Strange! if that be the *Summa rei Chriſtianæ*, as *Bellarmin* calls it (in the Preface to his Book *de Romano Pontifice*) the *Summ and Foundation of the Chriſtian* Religion.

And as ſilent are the *Scriptures* concerning the ſuppoſed *Univerſal Supremacy* of St. *Peter*, or that he ever was at *Rome*, or Biſhop of *Rome*. Some after Writers have mentioned it; but that is far from ſuch an *Univerſal Tradition* as is ſufficient for the mighty Superſtructure which is raiſed upon it. But let it be granted it ſignifies nothing, becauſe all is founded upon ſome Words ſaid to St. *Peter*, ſuch as, *Thou art* Peter—*Feed my Sheep*—

&c.

&c. Which cannot be ſtrained to ſuch an *Univerſal Supremacy* as the *Popes* have claimed, nor were ſo underſtood in the Primitive Church. For which I refer your Lordſhip to a Book I know you value, and favoured me with the Peruſal of it, the Learned Monſieur *du Pin* his *Traité de la Puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique & Temporelle*. Printed at *Paris*, 1707. where *p.* 495. to *p.* 501. and *p.* 754. to *p.* 765. you will find all theſe Texts urged for the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, anſwered in the ſame manner as is done by the *Proteſtant* Writers, and it is ſhewed how very Foreign they are from the Purpoſe intended.

And that the *Rock* upon which *Chriſt* ſaid he would build His *Church* was not *Peter*, but the *Faith* which *Peter* then Confeſſed, your Lordſhip may ſee the current Senſe of the *Fathers*, and conſult at your leiſure St. *Auguſtine*, de Verb. Dom. Ser. 13. *Nazianzen* de Vet. Teſtam. St. *Cyril*, de Trin. lib. 4. St. *Chryſoſtom*, Hom. 55. in Matth. St. *Ambroſe*, Com. in Epheſ. 2. *Hilary*, de Trin. lib. 2. cap. 6. And there are many others. *Matth.* xvi. 18.

But nothing that was ſaid of St. *Peter* is ſo expreſs for an *Univerſal Supremacy* as what St. *Paul* ſaid of himſelf, 2 *Cor.* xi. 28. That *the Care of all the Churches* lay upon him. And again, 1 *Cor.* vii. 17. *So Ordain I in all Churches.* If ſuch a *Decretal* could be produced of St. *Peter's*, I doubt not it would have been made uſe of towards proving his *Univerſal Supremacy*. In the *Acts of the Apoſtles* it is told that St.

Paul

Paul was at *Rome* Preaching the Gospel for two whole Years together, *Acts* xxviii. 30, 31. But not a word of St. *Peter*'s being there. And as St. *PAUL* planted the Gospel at *Rome*, so he wrote to the Church there as his particular Charge, for says he, *Rom.* xi. 13. *I speak to you Gentiles, in as much as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine Office.* But St. *Peter* was the Apostle of the *Jews*, they were his particular Charge; and he himself allowed *that the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to* Paul, *as the Gospel of the Circumcision was to himself*, Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9. And accordingly he directed his Epistle to the *Jews* of the Dispersion who were *Strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia,* and *Bithynia.* But he wrote not to the *Gentiles*, particularly not to *Rome*, which would seem strange if he had been Bishop of *Rome*, and that had been his Chief and Principal Charge. And St. *Paul*'s both *withstanding him to the Face* before the whole Church of *Antioch*, in behalf of the *Gentiles* whom he had misled, *fearing them who were of the Circumcision*, shews the Care St. *Paul* took of those who were more particularly his Charge; and seems a Behaviour not very suitable to the Supreme *Head* of the *Church* both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, if St. *Paul* had known any thing of St. *Peter*'s being so Constituted by Christ.

And as little had it become the other *Apostles* to *send* their *Soveraign* upon Business, as they sent *Peter* to *Samaria*, Acts. viii. 14.

But

But if, as some say, St. *Peter* was Bishop of the *Jewish* Converts at *Rome*, and St. *Paul* of the *Gentiles* there, St. *Paul* would have had a much greater Flock than St. *Peter*, and the Successors of St. *Paul*, and not of St. *Peter*, must have been *Bishops* there, because the Church of *Rome* is now, and has long been all of the *Gentiles*.

But the surest way to find out the Truth is by Fact, and not straining Expressions, which may have several Meanings. The Eastern Monarchs have used to give themselves mighty Titles, as Son of the Sun, and Brother of the Stars, and King of all the Kings of the Earth, *&c.* But will any believe that any of them was the Universal Monarch for all this, contrary to plain Fact?

Pray, My Lord, let me ask you, do you think one could Write the History of a King, suppose of King *Charles* the 2d, and in all the History neither call him *King*, mention his Restoration, Coronation, or tell of one *Regal* Act ever he did, as calling a Parliament, or Presiding in it, Sending or Receiving an Ambassador, or Granting a Commission, *&c.* And so of a *Pope*, could his History be wrote without calling him *Pope*, or telling of one *Papal* Act of his?

L. No, it is impossible, For such an History could not be called the History of a *King*, or of a *Pope*.

G. Now, my Lord, let me apply this. We have the History of the *Acts of the Apostles*,

ſtles, in which S. *Peter* has a great ſhare, though not ſo much as St. *Paul*, and there is a *Council* mentioned wherein both of them were preſent, and there is not a Tittle of any Superiority of St. *Peter* over St. *Paul*, or any other of the Apoſtles, either in that *Council*, or any where elſe throughout that whole Hiſtory, which, as your Lordſhip has determined, is impoſſible if St. *Peter* had that Supremacy which the Popes have Claimed as his Succeſſors.

This is ſo Demonſtrative a Proof that the Writers on your ſide think it neceſſary for them to endeavour ſome Solution to it. But the Weakneſs of their Anſwer is a yet greater Confirmation on our Side. For they can find no other way to get ſome Superiority to St. *Peter* in this *Council* than to ſuppoſe that he opened it, becauſe, as they ſay, he ſpoke firſt, which would not infer the Supremacy they intend, if it were true; but it is plainly otherwiſe; for it is ſaid, *Acts* xv. 7. *And when there had been much diſputing*, Peter *roſe up and ſaid* —— Nor did he ſpeak laſt, for after he had done *Paul* and *Barnabas* declared the Converſion of the *Gentiles*, by their means, without putting them under the *Law*, which was the Point in Debate; and after they had held their Peace, St. *James* who was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, where the *Council* was held, did, as Preſident, reſume what had been ſaid by St. *Peter* and others, and gave his definitive Sentence upon the whole, *Wherefore my Sentence is*—

And

And the Decree of the *Council* was drawn up in the Words of St. *James*. So that it is plain he closed the *Council*, whoever opened it or spoke first, which is not so material as to be told in this Account of that *Council*. But dismissing the *Council*, and putting an End to it seems of greater Authority. If what is said of St. *James* here had been said of St. *Peter*, I question not it would have been made use of as a full Proof of his *Supremacy*, and *Presiding* in that *Council*.

L. I must confess the History of the New Testament is very barren, as to Facts relating to the Authority of St. *Peter* over the other Apostles. We must depend upon the Texts before mentioned of *Feed my Sheep*, &c.

G. None of these Texts are so express as what I quoted of St. *Paul*. But if they were meant in that Extent for which you produced them, it is impossible but that must appear in the Facts of St. *Peter*, especially in the part he bore in that *Council* at *Jerusalem*. And *Facts* are the surest Explanation of *Words*.

We discourse now only of *Authority*, what *Authority* one Apostle had over another, for that is the Point wherein we are concerned. We speak not of their Gifts and Graces, and their Labours in propagating the Gospel, wherein one might be more Eminent and Successful than another, but this gave him no *Authority* over the others. And in this also St. *Paul* had the Preference, for *He laboured more abundantly than they all*, 1 Cor. xv. 10. And all the *Epistles* almost

almoſt are his, to the ſeveral *Churches*. And his *Miracles* and *Converſions* of *Infidels* take up a much greater part in the *Acts of the Apoſtles* than thoſe of St. *Peter*.

I have ſaid ſo much of this Matter, becauſe the ſuppoſed *Supremacy* of St. *Peter*, his being at *Rome*, and Biſhop of *Rome*, is the whole Foundation of that *Supremacy* claimed by the *Biſhop* or *Church* of *Rome*.

And if that be ſo Eſſential a Point, and upon which the *Unity* of the *Church* depends, inſomuch that without it there is no *Church* at all, according to the Scheme drawn by Modern *Rome*; it is inconceivable the *Scriptures* ſhould be ſo wholly ſilent in it, nay, ſhewing the very contrary in Fact, as I have ſaid already concerning St. *Peter*. And when the direct Queſtion was put to our Bleſſed *Saviour*, upon the Conteſt among the *Apoſtles* which of them ſhould be the Greateſt, *Luke* xxii. 24. I ſay if this was ſo material a Point as to the very Being of the *Church*, it is inconceivable He ſhould not have Determined it, but by His Anſwer rather checkt the Error of their Thought, and left them all upon the Level.

(3.) *L.* I would gladly know your Notion of the *Unity* of the *Church*, if all *Biſhops*, as you ſay of the *Apoſtles*, were upon the Level, without any *Head Biſhop*, or *Principle* of *Unity* among them; for we are told that *Chriſt* has but *one Church* upon *Earth*.

G.

G. Your Lordſhip may add, and in *Heaven* too; for all are *one Church* to *Chriſt*, of which He alone is the *Head.* And one Part being *Militant*, the other *Triumphant*, makes them not two *Churches*, but two *States* of the ſame *Church*; which is called *One Family in Heaven and Earth.* Eph. iii. 15. In like Manner, *Heaven*, *Earth*, and *Hell* are one *Kingdom* to the Great *Creator*, for *His Kingdom ruleth over all.* And of the *Earth* it is ſaid, *The Kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the Governor among the Nations*, Pſal. xxii. 28. All the *Nations* are one *Kingdom* to Him. But he has appointed no *Univerſal* Monarch as His *Deputy* of his *Kingdom* of the *Earth*, but each *Nation* is Governed by their reſpective *Rulers*, independent of each other. For ſo His Wiſdom has Diſpoſed, according to the Capacity of his Creatures, for what Man would be ſufficient to Govern the whole World? And where muſt the *Seat* be of this *Univerſal* Monarch? Muſt he not have as many or more *Deputies* under him as there are now *Kings* or *Nations?* And what Prudence could prevent Defections and Rebellions in far diſtant Provinces? This has overthrown great Monarchies, which have fallen with their own Weight. What then could ſupport an *Univerſal* Monarchy? when *Nations* go to War, other Neighbour *Kings* and *States* may Interpoſe, aſſiſt the Oppreſſed, be *Mediators* and *Guarantees* of Peace. But this could not be in Caſe of Defection from the *Univerſal* Monarch, for who aſſiſt *Rebels* are *Rebels* themſelves.

And such Wars could not but end in the utter Destruction of the one side or the other. Therefore God has Consulted best for the Peace and Safety of Mankind in Distributing the World into several Independent Governments, rather than to put all under the Dominion of One.

L. But when Nations are at *War*, where is the *Unity* of this one *Kingdom* of *God* upon *Earth*.

G. It is disturbed where those *Wars* are. But it is not yet totally Dissolved: For there are *Laws* of *War*, wherein all agree. There is still what we call the *Law of Nations*, which as it Maintains Commerce in *Peace*, so it regulates the Fury of *War*. And there is one *Unity* which nothing can Dissolve, that is, *God having made of one Blood all Nations upon the Earth*. So that here is an *Unity* of *Relation*, of *Humanity*, and of common *Principles* which all retain.

L. But how is this Unity kept?

G. Not as it should be. But so as is Consistent with our fallen State, and the Corruptions of Mankind. It is not such an *Unity* as is in God's Kingdom of *Heaven*; which yet was once Disturbed by *Rebellion*.

L. But there ought to be a stricter *Unity* in the *Church* than in the *Temporal* World?

G. I wish it were so, but alas it is not. And the Frailty of Man shews it self in the *Church* as well as in the *State*. The many *Heresies* and *Divisions* in the *Church* have rent her to pieces and broke her *Unity*, as much as *Wars* have that of the *Temporal* World.

L.

L. That is for not adhering to the *Head* and *Universal Monarch* of the *Church*.

G. No, my Lord, it is that Pretence in the Church of *Rome* has been the great Cause of these Divisions. It has procured *Peace* in the *Church*, just as setting up an *Universal Monarchy* would in the *World*, that is, fill it with more Confusion and Bloodshed than ever was in it, or could otherwise possibly be. For which reason God has appointed no *Universal Monarch* in the *Church* more than in the *State*. For as *Gregory* the Great said to *John* Bishop of *Constantinople* (who, upon the *Seat* of the *Empire* being Translated thither, set up for an *Universal Supremacy* in the *Church*) *If the Church should come to Depend upon One, it must suddenly fall.* And St. *Cyprian* said, *That therefore Christ made the College of Bishops numerous, that if one should fall or turn Heretical, the rest might interpose for the saving of the Flock*: For he says, there is but *one Flock, and one Episcopat*, of which every Bishop has the whole in Partnership with the rest. *Episcopatus Unus est, cujus à Singulis in Solidum pars tenetur.* This was the frame of the *Church* in his Days, and before from the Apostles; this was the very State of the *Apostles* themselves, who thus shared of the *Apostolat*, the whole of which was given to each, in Partnership, or in Common with the rest.

L. This then is your Notion of the *Church* that as all *Nations* upon the *Earth* are *One Kingdom* to *God*, so all *Christian Churches* are *One Church* to *Christ*, without any *Universal Mo-*

narch in either Case. And that as the *Unity* of the *World* consists in what we call the *Law of Nations*, which is common to all; so the *Unity* of the *Church* consists in the common *Christianity* wherein all agree.

If so, then every one who Believeth in *Christ* is a *Christian.*

G. Yes surely, as every one that Believeth in *Mahomet* is a *Mahometan.*

L. Then there is no need to be of any *Church*, if you Believe in *Christ* that is enough.

G. No, we must obey His *Commandments* too, which oblige us to live Peaceably and Quietly as *Members* of that *Body* or *Church* whereto we appertain, with Christian Love and Fellowship with all others, and not to make *Schisms* and *Divisions* by breaking *Communion*, where nothing *Sinful* is required as a *Condition* of it. And when such Disorderly Persons are cast out of the *Church*, or cut themselves off by a Causeless *Separation*, though they are no longer of the *Church*, yet they cease not to be *Christians*; (that is a *Nostrum* of the Church of *Rome*) and they must Answer for their *Schism* as for other *Sins*, all of which are *Damnable* in their own Nature, without *Repentance*: And yet Allowances are made for Invincible *Ignorance* occasioned by the Prejudices of *Education*, &c. but not for *Obstinacy*. No *Society* of Men would bear such Perverse *Members* among them.

Now a *Church* is a *Society* professing such a *Religion*, be it True or False. Thus there is a *Church* of the *Jews*, of *Heathens*, of *Christians*,

ſtians, and *Mahometans*. And I would aſk your Lordſhip which is any of theſe *Churches*, for Inſtance, which is the *Church* of the *Mahometans*?

L. It is the *Turks*, *Moors*, *Perſians*, the Great *Mogul*, &c.

G. Yet there is no *Chief Prieſt* over all theſe, but every *Church* as *Nation* is Independant of each other. And thus among the ſeveral *Nations* and *Churches* of the *Heathens*. The *Jews* were but one *Nation*, and a ſmall one, therefore they had as one *King*, ſo one *High Prieſt*. There was ſomething like this in that part of the *Chriſtian Church* which was within the *Roman Empire*. But to extend the *Supremacy* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* beyond the Limits of the *Emperor* of *Rome*, even to all the *Chriſtian Churches* in the World, is a Fancy never came into the Heads of any other Mortals, and is not neceſſary to Denominate many *Churches* profeſſing the ſame *Religion* to be one *Church*, as of the *Heathens* and *Mahometans*, all of which are called the *Heathen* or the *Mahometan Church* or *Churches*; without any common *Head* over them all. And there is not one word in *Scripture* appointing ſuch an *Univerſal Head* in the *Chriſtian Church*, or altering this common Sentiment of Mankind, as to the meaning of the word *Church*, or taking it in any other Senſe than commonly underſtood by all the World. And thus in our way of ſpeaking, when we ſay the *Fathers* of the *Church*, or the Primitive *Church*, we mean not any particular *Church*,

but the whole *Body* or *Church* of *Christians*, though divided into many *Nations* or *Churches*.

L. But all in Subordination to the *Church* of *Rome*.

G. What? Before there was a *Church* of *Rome!* For there were Christian *Churches* before, as I have told you. And after there was a *Church* at *Rome*, the Bishops and Fathers of those Times knew nothing of it's *Supremacy*, far less of it's *Infallibility*, nor ever Appealed to it in their Disputes with *Hereticks*, which had been the shortest and the surest way, and impossible to have been forgot, had it been known, and received as the Current *Faith*, or but *Opinion* of the *Church*. But on the contrary, other *Churches* have Contended with that of *Rome*, and Asserted their own Liberties and Independency upon her, when her Encroachments began to arise and disturb the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *Church*, which I shall shew you presently. But this is only to let you see, That the *Unity* of the *Church* was then understood, not as being *United* under any one Supreme *Bishop* or *Church*; but in the Concord and good Agreement of the several *Churches* among themselves, and in the *Unity* of the Common *Faith*. Which *Unity* is Described by their all having *One Lord*, *One Faith*, *One Baptism*, and *One Spirit*, from which they are called *one Body*. The *Unity of the Spirit* is their *Unity* with *God*, and the *Bond of Peace* is the *Unity* of the *Churches* with each other, as Members of *Eph.* iv. 3, 4, 5.

of the ſame *Body*. And this is a much ſtricter and cloſer *Union* than that of the *Secular* World. All *Churches* agree in that Summary of our *Faith* called the *Apoſtles Creed*. And the Church of *Rome* her ſelf muſt think this ſufficient for Salvation, becauſe ſhe requires no other Profeſſion of *Faith* in *Baptiſm*, or for being admitted into the *Church*. But the Twelve new *Articles* of *Faith* which the Council of *Trent* has added to the Twelve of the Apoſtles, which we call Pope *Pius* his *Creed*, and is required to be Profeſſed by Converts, has made many Conteſts and Diviſions in the *Church*; and I have not yet met with any *Roman Catholick* ſo hardy as to ſay, that the Belief of all theſe is neceſſary to Salvation, only that we ſhould not deny or oppoſe them, ſuch as *Purgatory*, the *Invocation of Saints*, &c.

(4) *L.* The *Church* pretends not to make *new Articles of Faith*, but only to explain the *old ones*. And ſuch are what you call the *new Articles* of *Trent*.

G. What *Article* in the *Apoſtles Creed* does *Tranſubſtantiation* explain? For there is nothing at all of the *Sacraments* in that *Creed*.

L. Are not the *Sacraments* then part of our *Faith*?

G. They are the *Signs* and *Seals* of our *Faith* as *Circumciſion* was called, *Rom.* iv. 11. but not the *Faith* it ſelf, and therefore are not put into that Summary of our *Faith*.

L. But are they not neceſſary to Salvation?

G. They are *generally Neceſſary*, as our *Catechiſm* words it, that is, to be Reverendly uſed when they may be had: But they are not *abſolutely Neceſſary*, ſo that if our Circumſtances, or Places where we live are ſuch as not to afford us the Opportunity of Receiving the *Sacraments*, we ſhould be *Damned* for want of them. I think none will ſay this. They are *Means* of *God*'s Appointment, therefore to be uſed, when we can have them; we are tyed to this, but *God* is not tyed to thoſe *Means* to which He ties us. He can ſave without them.

L. But we have ſeven *Sacraments*, and you have but two.

G. That is, we take the word *Sacrament* in a ſtricter Senſe than you do. And of the five which you have more than we, you cannot ſay that they are ſo much as *generally Neceſſary* to Salvation, becauſe none can partake of them all, for your Sacrament of *Orders* excludes all the *Laity*, and that of *Marriage* the *Clergy*.

(5.) *L.* It is a ſad thing that the *Church* ſhould be Divided about theſe Matters. But we are all one, you are miſerably Divided. How many *Sects* or *Churches* are there among you?

G. Not ſo many as with you.

L. How can that be? We have but one *Church* which we own as such.

G. If a *Church* is answerable for all that break off from her, then you have all these *Sects* to reckon for, and us too, which is one more.

L. A *Church* is not answerable for those who Break off from her, because they are no longer of her.

G. Then we are not answerable for these *Sects* which Break off from our *Church*.

L. But we are all one among our selves.

G. So is every *Church* or *Sect*, that is, *those* who agree among themselves, do agree! So that this is no more a Mark of *Unity* than every *Division* of Men can plead, and every *Sect*.

(6.) *L.* But we are the great Body of Christians from which all broke off.

G. No, my Lord, not the half, or ever were: The Greek Church is an Elder Church than yours, so that you rather broke off from her, by setting up your *Universal Supremacy*; which she never owned, nor the many other numerous Churches in *Asia*; nor the Great and once Famous Churches in *Africa*; nor the Empire of *Russia* of vast Extent in *Europe*, once a part of the Greek Church. These never owned the *Supremacy* of *Rome*, and by far out-number all that ever did own it, or were of her Communion as such. And considering how many Kingdoms and Nations have broke off from her since the *Reformation*, her Communion is now reduced to a very small part of the *Christian Church*,

Church, in Comparison of those who differ from her.

L. But those other *Churches* do not all Communicate with each other.

G. Nor *Rome* with any of them. So that she stands by her self, as other *Churches* do. And the most Irreconcilable of any, because by her Principles she cannot Communicate with any who will not own her *Supremacy*. Which as it never was done by the greatest Part of the *Catholick Church*, so there is little appearance that ever it will be; for it is observable that no *Nation* which broke off from *Rome* did ever Return to her again. It is a hard matter for one that has Escaped out of a Snare, to be Inviegled thither again. So that it is very visible *Rome* has been upon the losing hand about this 200 Years past. And that not only as to those who have quite forsaken her, but as to the Change of Principles and Lowring her *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* amongst those who still remain in her Communion, which I shall shew your Lordship presently, and that Old and New Popery are very different things, and that *Rome* it self has in some measure been Reformed by our *Reformation*.

I know nothing should hinder me from Communicating with the Greek Church, if I were there, while nothing *Sinful* were Required of me as a *Condition* of *Communion*, nor new *Creeds* to be imposed on me: And so of the *Churches* of St. *Thomas*, the *Jacobites*, and others in the East of *Asia*; of whom we have very Imperfect and uncertain Accounts: And so of the *Abyssines*,

nes, the *Cophties*, and other *Churches* in *Africa*. The great *Church* of *Ruſſia* in *Europe*, &c. But *Rome*, while ſhe pretends to *Univerſal Supremacy*, can Communicate with none but with her Self. So that our Communion is much more Extended or Extendable than that of *Rome*. And this *Univerſal Supremacy* is that which, moſt of any one thing in the World, hinders the *Union* and *Communion* of *Chriſtian Churches*.

(7.) *L.* But though one *Church* may be *Supreme*, yet the beſt part of the Roman Catholicks place not the *Infallibility* there, but in a *General* or *Oecumenical Council* where all *Churches* meet.

G. There never was ſuch a *Council*. The *Roman Empire* had the Vanity to call it ſelf the *Oikumene*, which we tranſlate, *All the World*, Luke 2. 1. Hence the *Councils* called within that *Empire* Stiled themſelves *Oecumenical*, but no more truly ſo, than the *Roman Empire* was *All the World*. But the *Latin* Church was not ſo much as the *Oikumene* of the *Empire*, for *Greece* and other Parts of the *Greek* Church in *Aſia* were in it, eſpecially after the Seat of the Empire was tranſlated to *Conſtantinople*; when they contended with *Rome* for the *Supremacy*. And the *Latin* Church was not then called by the Name of the *Church* of *Rome*, as the Learned *du Pin* ſays in his *Traité de la Puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique*. &c. *p.* 551. *It is true* (ſays he) *that at preſent the Name of the Church of* Rome *is given to the Catholick Church, and that theſe two Terms paſs for Synonimous. But in Antiquity no more was intended*

ded by the Name of the Church of Rome, *than the Church of the City of* Rome, *and the Popes in their Subscriptions or Superscriptions took simply the Quality of Bishops of* Rome. *The Greek Schismaticks seem to be the first who gave the Name of the Church of* Rome, *to all the Churches of the West; whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the Churches which Communicated with the Church of* Rome, *from the Greeks who were separated from her Communion. From this came the Custom to give the Name of the Church of* Rome *to the Catholick Church. But the other Churches did not for this lose their Name, or their Authority*, &c. Then he goes on to Vindicate the Rights of every National Church, independent of the Church of *Rome*, and past her Power to Controul or Alter. And the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, *p.* 45, 46. *Appendix*, tells the *Pope* that his *Bishoprick* extends only to the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, and his *Patriarchat* to those Provinces called *Suburbicarian*. And that by taking upon him to Excommunicate others Unjustly, and where his Power did not reach, he had Excommunicated himself. And then he was so far from being *Head*, that he was not so much a *Member* of the *Church*. And they mind him, as likewise *du Pin* in the Treatise before mentioned *p.* 263. of the Stout Resistance made by the Bishops of *France* to the Pope who threatned to Excommunicate all of them that would not submit to his Decision; but they resolutely answered, That they would not submit to his Will, and that if he came there to

Excom-

Excommunicate them, he ſhould go back Excommunicated himſelf. *Si Excommunicaturus veniret, Excommunicatus abiret.* Now what is that *Head* can be Excommunicated by its *Members?* What is that *Supremacy* can be Limited and Controuled by its *Subjects*, and of which they are the Judges, and can ſay to it, as God to the Sea, *Hitherto ſhalt thou come and no farther, here ſhall thy proud Waves be Stayed?*

(8.) *L.* The Church of *France* place the abſolute *Supremacy* and the *Infallibility*, not in the *Pope* or *Church of Rome*, but in a *General Council.*

G. Which, as I told you, never was, and it is next to impoſſible ever ſhould be.

And this gives up your whole Foundation for the *Popes* and not *Councils* pretend to be the Succeſſors of St. *Peter*, and Heirs of all the Promiſes made to him.

In the next place, you are not Agreed among your ſelves concerning General Councils. *Bellarmin* (*de Concil.* l. 1. c. 6.) gives a liſt of *General Councils* which are to be Rejected, *Concilia Generalia reprobata*, ſome for not being Approved by the *Pope*, ſome for *Hereſy*, and ſome (he might have ſaid All) as not being Received by the *Univerſal Church*, but he meant only the *Church* of *Rome.* And *chap.* 7. is of *General Councils*, partly *Confirmed*, and partly *Reprobated.* And *chap.* 8. is of a *General Council* neither *Manifeſtly Approved*, nor *Manifeſtly Rejected.* This is going through all the Degrees of *Uncertainty.* And *c.* 5. and *de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 11. he ſays, The ſeveral things in thoſe *Councils* allowed to be *General* were foiſted in by *Hereticks*, he knows not how. This was to get rid of ſome Objections againſt theſe *Councils*

cils he could not Anſwer otherwiſe. And (*de Eccleſ. Milit. c.* 16.) he Quotes the laſt Council of *Lateran* Condemning the Council of *Baſil*, which he ſays was at firſt a true ŒEcumenical Council, and Infallible, but afterwards turned to a *Schiſmatical Conventicle*, and was of no Authority at all. The Church of *France* receive the Councils of *Baſil* and *Conſtance* wholly and throughout: But the Church of *Rome* reject both in part. So that they who place the *Infallibility* in *Councils*, will need another *Infallible Judge* to determin theſe Diſputes concerning the *Councils*; which are truly *General*, and which not; and which are *partly* ſo, and which *throughout*; and what *Part* of thoſe that are *throughout* have been Corrupted by *Hereticks*, if that can be called true *throughout* which is *Corrupted* in any Part. And when one *Council* condemns another, which ſhall we Believe? And if we muſt not believe every *Council* that calls it ſelf *Oecumenical*, we can believe no other *Council* againſt it, for the ſame Reaſon. The *Second Council* of *Epheſus* is generally Condemned in your *Church*; yet it called it ſelf *Oecumenical*, and was as much ſo as any of the others. And what a thing is it to ſay, that a *Council* is partly *right* and partly *wrong?* And who is judge of that? Is there any *Certainty* in this, far leſs *Infallibility?* And we muſt have an Infallible *Method* too to preſerve the *Acts* of theſe *Councils*, that they be not *Adulterated*, as *Bellarmin* ſays they have been; and they continue ſo to this day in the Volumes of their *Councils*. Why then are they

not

not Amended, and these *Suppositions* and *Adulterated* parts (these are *Bellarmin*'s own Words) struck out? But the several *Editions* of their *Councils* are in the Hands of other *Churches*, and therefore they can make no Alteration in them without being Detected.

So that the Scheme of the *Infallibility* you place in your *Councils* stands thus; the *Church* of *Rome* makes her self the *Universal* or *Catholick Church*, insomuch that all who are not of her Communion (which are by far the greatest part of the *Christian Churches* in the World) are out of the Pale of the *Catholick Church:* And *Schismaticks* and *Hereticks* are no Parts of a *Catholick Council:* Thus a small part of the *Latin Church* (exclusive of the *Greek* and all other *Churches*) are the whole *Catholick Church*, and these little *Party Councils*, under the Direction of the *Pope*, are *Universal* and *Infallible!* But, as is shewn, the Church of *Rome* has no Right to the Title of the *Latin* Church it self, far less of the *Universal*. And she has now but a small part of the *Latin* Church left her. The *Reformed*, with *Russia*, and the *Greek* Church, will out-number her in *Europe*, and she has no *National Church* in her Communion any-where else.

L. But there are some of her Communion in most Countries.

G. Not so many as of the *Jews*, who by this are more *Universal* than your *Church*, and so more *Catholick*. And none of the Scattered *Seminaries* of *Rome* in other *Christian Churches* can be said to Represent those *Churches* in a *General Council*,

Council, more than two or three Titular *Popiſh Biſhops* in *England* could Repreſent the *Church* of *England* as it now ſtands. But, on the contrary, their living in a ſeparate Communion in other *Chriſtian Churches*, ſhews thoſe *Churches* not to be of their *Communion*; and therefore cannot be Repreſented in any of their *Councils*. And theſe calling themſelves *Oecumenical*, as the *Roman Empire* did, ſhews only how little Criticiſms upon Words will avail againſt plain Matter of Fact; which I have ſhewed to be the Caſe as to thoſe Texts urged for the Supremacy of St. *Peter*. And that if *Words* would do it, there are more, nay and *Facts* too, for the *Univerſal Supremacy* of St. *Paul*, at leaſt over all the Chriſtian Churches of the *Gentiles*, which are all now in the World.

(9.) *L.* But there muſt be an *Infallibility* ſome where in the *Church*, and if it be neither in *Pope* nor *Council*, or that as you ſay, there never was, nor well can be a *General Council*, truly ſo called, that is, of all the *Churches* in the World, where do you place the *Infallibility*?

G. No where, my Lord, nor can it be among Men who are all *Fallible*.

L. We truſt not in Men, as Men, but Aſſiſted by the Infallible *Spirit of God*. And this He has Promiſed ſhall never depart from His *Church*, as He has ſaid, *Iſa.* lix. 21. *My Spirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy Mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seeds Seed, ſaith the Lord,*

Lord, from henceforth and for ever. And He has ſaid, *that the Prieſts lips ſhould keep knowledge, and they ſhould ſeek the Law at his Mouth, for he is the Meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts.* Mal. ii. 7.

G. Read the next Words, *But ye are departed out of the way: ye have cauſed many to ſtumble at the Law: ye have corrupted the Covenant of* Levi, *ſaith the Lord.* The firſt is what they ſhould or ought to have done, the ſecond is what they did do, which was quite contrary.

And notwithſtanding the Promiſe made in the firſt Text you quoted, yet *they were all gone out of the way, they were together become abominable, there was none that did good, no not one.—that all the World might become guilty before God,* as well the *Church* as the reſt of the World. *Rom.* iii. 12, 19. And of the *Church* it is ſaid, *The whole Head is ſick, and the whole Heart faint: from the ſole of the foot even unto the Head, there is no Soundneſs in it, but Wounds and Bruiſes and putrifying Sores.* Iſa. i. 5, 6. And God ſays, *Mine Heritage is unto me as a Lion in the foreſt, it cryeth out againſt me, therefore have I hated it; Mine Heritage is unto me as a ſpeckled bird*—&c. Jer. xii. 8, 9.

And we have now long ſince ſeen that *Church* of the *Jews*, to whom theſe Promiſes were made, quite thrown off, and the *Church* of the *Gentiles* come in its place.

L. Theſe Promiſes were ultimatly intended to the *Chriſtian* Church.

G. But they were firſt given to the *Jewiſh* Church, and belong even literally to her, and much more unconteſtably than to the Church of *Rome*, to whom no Promiſe whatſoever was made: Nor has ſhe any other Pretence to the Promiſes made to the Church in General, than her ſuppoſed *Supremacy* over all other Chriſtian Churches; which is diſputed with her, and Denyed by the other Churches. But there was none to Diſpute it with the *Jewiſh* Church, for ſhe was then the only *viſible Church* of *God* upon *Earth*. And if the Promiſes made to her, can fail, in vain does the Church of *Rome*, or even the whole *Gentile* Church claim theſe Promiſes as indefeaſible and unalterable to Her: For if the Promiſes made to the whole Church of God upon Earth can fail at one time, they may likewiſe at another, aud there can be no Certainty.

L. Can the Promiſes of God then fail?

G. No, that is impoſſible, but we may miſtake his Promiſes and not underſtand them aright. And we may not perform the Conditions required.

L. But the Promiſes made to the Church (that particularly which I have named of *Iſa.* lix. 21.) are *Poſitive* and *Unconditional.*

G. But there is ſtill a *Condition* implyed, that is, of our *Obedience*; which our Saviour has fully Exemplified in the Parable of the Huſbandmen who did not render the Fruits of the Vineyard. As Treaſon forfeits an Eſtate or Honours given by a Prince, though in never

ver so positive Terms, and without any Condition expressed, but that of *Allegiance* to the *Prince* is always implyed. And thus the Church may forfeit her Charter. God said to *Eli* the High-Priest of the Jewish Church, *I said indeed that thy House and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that Honour me I will Honour, and they that Despise me shall be lightly esteemed*, 1 Sam. ii. 30. And He said, Num. xiv. 34, *Ye shall know my breach of Promise*, or as our Margin reads it, *the altering of my Purpose*. And He has told us plainly that we are thus to understand his Promises as well as Threatnings, *Jer.* xviii. 7. &c. *At what instant I shall speak concerning a Nation* (or a Church) *to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that Nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their Evil, I will repent of the Evil I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a Nation* (or Church) *to build and to plant it, if it do Evil in my sight, that it obey not my Voice, then will I repent of the Good wherewith I said I would benefit them.*

This was the Language of the Prophets to the Jewish Church. But she understood it not, and leant upon the Promises made to her as Unconditional and Indefeasible, let her be as wicked as she would. And this hardned her against her *Prophets*, whom she persecuted for this reason as Enemies to the *Church*, as you find, *Jer.* xviii. 18. *Come and let us devise*

Devices againſt Jeremiah, for the Law ſhall not periſh from the Prieſt. Here the *Jewiſh* Church ſtuck, and here the Church of *Rome* ſticks at this Day.

L. But the *Gentile* Church cannot fail like the *Jewiſh*, for then there would be no *Church* at all.

G. The Apoſtle of the *Gentiles* ſays to the *Gentile* Church, *Thou alſo ſhalt be cut off, if thou continue not in the Goodneſs of God.* And that the *Jews, if they abide not ſtill in Unbelief, ſhall be graffed in; for God is able to graff them in again,* Rom. xi. 22, 23. This ſhews that all the Promiſes made either to the *Jewiſh* or the *Gentile* Church are conditional, *viz. If they continue in the Goodneſs of God: Otherwiſe,* ſays St. *Paul* to the *Gentile Church, Thou alſo ſhalt be cut off,* and of all the *Gentile* Churches this was ſaid more particularly to the Church of *Rome*, for this is in the Epiſtle wrote to Her, and to Her it was ſaid, *Thou alſo ſhalt be cut off.*

And of the *Church* in General, whether *Jewiſh* or *Gentile*, it is ſaid, *Luke* xviii. 8. *When the Son of Man cometh, ſhall he find Faith upon the Earth?* Where will then that *Viſibility* be which *Rome* boaſts of as an eſſential Mark of the true Church?

L. The *Church* is compared to a *City* ſet upon a *Hill*, to a *Candle* giving Light to all that are in the Houſe. This is to ſhew her *Viſibility.*

G. She

G. She is likewiſe compared to a *Woman* perſecuted into a *Wilderneſs*, *Rev.* xii. 6. to a Lodge in a Garden of *Cucumbers*, to a *beſieged City*. Iſa. i. 8. And laſtly, that ſhe will be ſo little *Viſible*, as that *Faith* ſhall hardly be found upon the *Earth*. This is not to be Reconciled but of different States of the *Church*, and at different times.

L. Chriſt ſays, *Eph.* v. 27. that *His Church is Glorious not having Spot or Wrinkle, or any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be Holy and without Blemiſh.* And He calls her His *Beloved.*

G. So God called the Church of the Jews, *Jer.* xii. 7. *The dearly Beloved of His Soul.* Yet ſays, He had *forſaken* her for her Wickedneſs, and *hated* her. And *Iſaiah* repreſents her as moſt filthy and corrupted, *chap.* i. 4, 5, 6.

The *Church* is called *Holy* and *Beloved* becauſe of God's *Covenant* with her to be His *Holy* and *Beloved*, which will be hereafter in thoſe that are perfected; when the *Tares* and the *Wheat* ſhall be ſeparated, but they muſt grow together till then, when *Chriſt ſhall gather out of His Kingdom all things that offend, and them which do Iniquity.* Mat. xiii. 41. Then, and not till then, will the Church be all *Glorious*, *without Spot or Wrinkle*, &c. As the Text ſays, *Eph.* v. 25. *Chriſt loved the Church, and gave Himſelf for it; that He might ſanctify and cleanſe it — that He might preſent it to Himſelf a Glorious Church not having Spot or Wrinkle*, &c. But He has not yet ſo preſented it. That time is not come. She is ſtill in her *cleanſing* State, but not yet thorough-

ly *cleanſed*. And the *Scripture* ſpeaks of both theſe *States* of the *Church*, but when we diſtinguiſh not, and would apply to the moſt *corrupt* State what is ſaid of the moſt *Glorious*, We muſt needs fall into many Errors and Miſtakes.

This is the Difficulty under which the Church of *Rome* now labours, She firſt making her ſelf *the Catholick Church*: And then applying to her ſelf, in this her *corrupt* State, whatever is ſaid of the *Church* even in her *Perfect*, *Glorious*, and *Triumphant* State; creates her infinite Trouble, and endleſs Diſtinctions, to reconcile theſe; which is as impoſſible to be done as to make the State of the *Church* in *Heaven* and upon the *Earth* to be the ſame: And while the Corruptions in the Church of *Rome* are confeſſed and lamented by the moſt Learned and moſt Pious in her own Communion.

And ſhe may as well maintain her *Impeccability*, as her *Infallibility*; for Sin is the greateſt *Error*: And therefore I think nothing can be *Infallible*, but what is likewiſe *Impeccable*.

(10.) *L.* The Apoſtles were *Infallible*, but not *Impeccable*.

G. As much the one as the other. St. *Peter* Erred, and *Walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Goſpel*. And *many were carried away with his Diſſimulation*. Gal. ii. 13, 14. And St. *Paul* owned that in ſome caſes he *had no Commandment of the Lord*, only *gave his Judgment*, as a private Perſon, and *ſpoke by permiſſion, and not*

of

of Commandment. But in other Cases he says, *I command, yet not I but the Lord—And to the rest speak I, not the Lord.* And it is so, *after my Judgment; and I think also that I have the Spirit of God,* 1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, 40. And no doubt great Deference was paid to his Judgment, as being an inspired Person, but not infallible in every thing, as he himself said. The Apostles were enabled to work many and great Miracles, which gave them full Credence as to what they delivered for Christian Doctrine. But this was no Personal nor Universal Infallibility.

(11) *L.* The Church of *Rome* has her *Miracles* too.

G. What! Both true and false? Can both come from God?

L. I know you deny our *Miracles.*

G. And you cannot deny the many *false* Miracles which have been notoriously detected in the Church of *Rome.* But if one *Sham-Miracle* had been found in the *Apostles*, I am afraid it had discredited all the others, and called their Mission in question whether it was from *God* or not. The *Devil* has Power (when Permitted) to *shew great Signs and Wonders*, as we are told *Mat.* xxiv. 24. 2 *Thess.* ii. 9. and the Reason is given *verse* 12. *viz.* as a just Punishment to *Unrighteousness.* But one *False* or Pretended *Miracle* is sufficient to disprove all that come from the same Hand. Therefore your Books of *Miracles*, the *Legends*, must

either all be believed, or all rejected, all coming from the same Authority; and the greatest part of them are so very gross and simple, that no Man of Sense among you will say, that he can believe half of them. And your Learned call them *Piæ Fraudes*, *Holy Cheats*, to stir up the Devotion of the *Vulgar*, who swallow all *Implicity!* And your Lordship will have Difficulty enough to believe all the *Miracles* alledged of their *Reliques*. And, as I said, you must take all, or none. Unless you think that *God* can work true *Miracles*, and the *Devil* false ones, by the same means, and at the same time! Can you believe the Quantities that have been shewn of the *Virgin* *Mary*'s Milk at several times and places? And so of the Wood of the *Cross* that is shewed in many places? Is it the same *Head* or *Body* of the same *Saint*, that is shewn at different *Churches*, each of which contend that they have the true one? And each have *Miracles* to vouch the Truth of their *Relique!* You may see a large Collection of these, and the Monstrousness of the Legends out of which they are taken, in a Book intituled, *The Devotions of the Roman Church*. Which will prevent my giving Instances in all the Points before mentioned.

Upon the whole, this Pretence of *Miracles*, the *Legends*, and Shops of *Reliques*, which are bought and sold, instead of a Proof, are the greatest Prejudice to Men of Sense against your Church.

And

And it is the foreſt Blow that *Chriſtianity* has received, while the common People put theſe *Legends* upon the Level with the Holy *Scriptures*, as having both the ſame Foundation, that is, the *Authority* of your *Church*. Whence *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* take a Handle to render both alike Fabulous.

(12.) *L.* But after all, we believe the *Scriptures* upon the Authority of the *Church*.

G. This is the old *Circle* out of which you can never Conjure your ſelves. You believe the *Scriptures*, becauſe the *Church* bids you; and you believe the Church becauſe the *Scriptures* bid you. This is running round, and proving a thing by it ſelf.

L. No. For we eſtabliſh the Authority of the *Church* in the firſt place, thus We think it inconſiſtent with the Goodneſs of *God* not to give Men an *Infallible Guide* to lead them in the right way to Heaven, ſince our own *Reaſon* is ſo weak that we cannot truſt to it: and that Guide is the *Church*.

G. How do you know that? What have you but your own *Reaſon* to tell you ſo? And if you cannot truſt your *Reaſon*, you cannot believe the *Church*. So that all bottoms upon your own *Reaſon* ſtill, from which you ſtrive in vain to eſcape.

L. But the *Scriptures* bid us believe the *Church*.

G. This is running into your *Circle* again, to believe the *Church* for the *Scriptures*, and

the

the *Scriptures* for the *Church*. But I will bring you out of it. For pray tell me, why do you believe a *God?* It would be Blasphemy to say, you believe it upon any *Authority*, for that would place such an *Authority* above *God*. And it would be Nonsense to say you believe it either from the *Church*, or the *Scriptures*; because you can believe neither, without first believing there is a *God*. What is it then? We believe a *God* purely upon our own *Reason*. And we cannot be more sure that there is a *God*, than we are perswaded of the Truth of those *Reasons* upon which we do believe it. And if *God* has given us no other Guide but our own *Reason*, with the assistance of his *Grace*, to believe in himself; if this be all we have, or can have, for the first and main Article of our *Creed*, what further do we require for those of less Consequence? And that we cannot have more Assurance than this, we may perceive by this Experiment, *viz.* Whether we believe most firmly and with greatest Assurance, what we have only from our own *Reason*, or what we receive upon the Authority of the *Church?* For Example, are you not more undoubtedly assured of the Being of a *God* which you believe purely upon your own *Reason*, than of *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, or whatever you believe upon the Authority of your *Church?*

And to say, that *God* is obliged to give every Man an *outward infallible Guide*, is making too Bold with *Providence*, and measuring his

infinite

infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs by our ſhort Line. He has made Creatures as it has pleaſed Him. Some Incapable of Happineſs or Miſery, as the *Inanimates*; ſome capable only of Pleaſures or Pain of *Senſe*, as *Animals*; and He has endowed others with *Reaſon*, as *Man*, and *left him in the hand of his own Counſel, ſet Good and Evil, Life and Death before him*, and free Will to chuſe which liketh him, *Deut.* xi. 26. xx. 15. *Ecclus.* xv. 14. *&c.* Again of Rational Creatures, ſome He has fixed in Happineſs, as the Bleſſed of Heaven; others are Veſſels of Wrath, as the Angels that fell: But Man is betwixt theſe two, to work out his own Salvation by his Obedience to the Will of God. Who will Judge every Man according to what He has given him. *For as many as have Sinned without the Law, ſhall be judged without the Law; as they that have Sinned in the Law, ſhall be judged by the Law. For there is no reſpect of Perſons with God*, Rom. ii. 11. 12. But according to your Argument there is great Reſpect of Perſons with Him, and His Goodneſs has failed the far greateſt Part of Mankind from the beginning of the World; for what outward Guide is there to *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, and *Chriſtians*; and to the many Subdiviſions among all theſe? And all theſe have Guides of their own, and the Blind lead the Blind with moſt of them. For it is Fact that the Generality of Mankind do not chuſe for themſelves, but take their Religion upon Truſt as they are

Educated.

Educated. And we muſt leave all this to God, who will require from none more than He has given; for *the Lord is good to all: and His tender Mercies are over all his Works*, Pſal. cxlv. 9.

(13.) *L.* Can any be ſaved then but by *Chriſt?*

G. No. But many may be ſaved by Him who never heard of him. He dyed to make Satisfaction to the Infinite Juſtice for the Sins of the whole World: and took our *Nature* upon Him, to atone for our fallen *Nature*, to be applied to ſuch who perform the Conditions required. He will judge the *Gentiles* by the Law of *Morality*, which he has planted in their Hearts, and we call *Natural Religion:* But from *Chriſtians* He requires *Faith* in *Chriſt*, joined with ſincere *Repentance.*

L. Then the *Gentiles* are in better Condition than we, becauſe leſs is required of them.

G. Is it no Advantage then to have the *Glory of God* revealed to us, *in the face of Jeſus Chriſt?* As the Apoſtle ſpeaks, 2 *Cor.* iv. 6. And the Effect of it upon us is deſcribed, chap. 3. ver. 18. viz. *That we all with open face, beholding as in a glaſs the glory of the Lord, are changed into the ſame image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.* The ſight of the wonderful Oeconomy of our Redemption muſt needs fill our Souls with Rapture and Joy, when we behold the Glory of God in all

all His Attributes, each Exalting the other to the Uttermoſt, as it is ſaid, *Jam.* ii. 13. *Miſerecordia Superexaltat Judicium*, that the *Mercy* of God exalts His *Juſtice*; for *Juſtice* requires full *Satisfaction*, it cannot remit a farthing: To Remit is *Mercy* and not *Juſtice*: And God is *Juſtice* it ſelf, *Juſtice* in the Abſtract. Here then Infinite *Wiſdom* finds out a full *Satisfaction* to Infinite *Juſtice*: And Infinite *Goodneſs* affords that *Satisfaction*, by the *Incarnation*, perfect *Obedience*, Meritorious *Paſſion*, and Glorious *Reſurrection*, &c. of the only begotten *Son* of *God!* This enflames our *Devotion*, invigorates our *Obedience*, and gives Compunction to our *Repentance*, when we *have ſinned and come ſhort of the glory of God*, Rom. iii. 23. God has vouchſafed to make a *Covenant* with us in *Chriſt*, by vertue of which we may appeal to His *Juſtice* and *Veracity*. It is a *Pardon* Signed and Sealed by the *King*, which we may Plead in Court. The *Heathen* have not this, but they are ſtill under his *Mercy*, they may ſay, God is *merciful* to forgive us: But we may ſay with St. *John*, that God is *Faithful* and *Juſt* to *forgive us our Sins, and to cleanſe us from all Unrighteouſneſs*, 1 John i. 9. This is a great, a very great Advantage we have above the *Gentiles*. And may not we enjoy it with Thankfulneſs, and not Damn them all to the Pit of Hell? Becauſe God has made a *Covenant* with us, may we not leave them to His *Un-covenanted* Mercy? Is our Eye evil to them, becauſe He has been good to us? Or would

would we limit His Mercies to His Creatures, with whom we have nothing to do? *For what have we to do to Judge them that are without? ——Them that are without* God *judgeth*, 1 Cor. v. 12. And God did Judge one who was *without*, that is, out of the Pale of the *Church*, to be the most Beloved of God, and that *there was none like him in the Earth*, Job i. 8. And he is put upon the Level with the greatest in the Church, *Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it*, &c. Ezek. xiv. 14. And as God chose a *Gentile* to be the great Example of *Patience* to all Ages, *Jam.* v. 11. And of another *Gentile* it was said by Christ, *I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel*, Luk. vii. 9. And He who said often to His Disciples, *O ye of little Faith*; And upbraided his Apostles with their Unbelief, *Mark* xvi. 14. yet said to a Woman of *Canaan*, (who would not be discouraged for the Objection He put against her, of her not being within the Pale of the Church, but without among the Dogs) *O Woman great is thy faith*, Matth. xv. 26. And of the ten healed there was but one thankful, *and he was a Samaritan*, Luke xvii. 16. that is, a *Schismatick*, a *Stranger*, as Christ here calls him, *ver.* 18. and said to him, *thy Faith hath made thee whole*. And the Pattern of *Charity* is placed in the Person of a *Samaritan*, in opposition to both a *Priest* and a *Levite*, Luke x. 30. &c. Which makes good what St. *Peter* said of *Cornelius* a *Gentile*, Acts x. 34. *Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of Persons: But in every Nation, he that feareth Him, and*

and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. This is the Doctrine which *Christ* taught, *Luke* iv. 25. *&c.* When he minded the *Jews*, that a Widow of *Sarepta*, a City of *Sidon*, and *Naaman* the *Syrian* were preferred to all the Widows and Lepers in *Israel.* Which so enraged the *Jews*, tenacious of the Privilege of the *Church*, that they *thrust Him out of the City, and led him unto the brow of the Hill (whereon their City was built) that they might cast him down headlong.* And it is said, that they were *filled with Wrath.* The like Fury they shewed when St. *Paul* told them that the Gospel was to be extended beyond the Pale of their *Church*, and that God had sent him to the *Gentiles. And they gave him Audience unto that word, and then lift up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the Earth; for it is not fit that he should live. And they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the Air,* Acts xxii. 22. And the like Rage is seen among the Zealots of your Church, when they hear of the Gospel being extended out of the Pale of their Communion; though with *Christians* who hold the three ancient *Creeds*, and have every thing Essential to a *Church*, except what *Rome* has made so, *viz.* The Universal and Unlimited *Soveraignty* of her *Bishop.* Which is the great Bone of Contention, wherein *Rome* stands single by her self, thrusting all other Christian Churches from her; like a Man in a Boat who thinks he thrust the Shore from him, whereas he only thrust himself from the Shore;

Shore; as *Firmilian* said to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, *Excidisti te ipsum, noli te fallere*, — "Do "not deceive your self, you have cut your "self off from the Church; for he is truly a "*Schismatick* who has made himself an Apo- "state from the Communion of Ecclesiastical "Unity; for while you think you can Ex- "communicate all other Churches from you, "you have only Excommunicated your self "from them. *Dum enim putas omnes à te Abstineri posse, te ipsum Abstinuisti.* Cyprian Ep. 75. p. 228. Edit. Oxon.

But the Church of the *Jews* had a much stronger Plea for her Universal *Supremacy* and *Infallibility*, because all *Proselytes*, of whatever Nations, must come in to Her, for there was no other visible *Church* of God upon Earth; and the Sacrifices were limited to the Temple at *Jerusalem*. Accordingly we find, *Acts* viii. 27. that the *Eunuch* came out of *Ethiopia* to *Jerusalem* for to Worship.

Now if the Christian Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, the most solemn Worship of God, were confined to St. *Peter's Church* at *Rome*, and could be had no where else; as the most solemn Worship of God; the legal Sacrifices, which were Types of the Christian, were confined to the *Temple* at *Jerusalem*: And if the Church of *Rome*, like that of the *Jews*, were the only *Church* in the World: Yet after all, would the *Church* of *Rome* have no more Pretence to *Infallibility* and *Perpetuity* than the *Church* of the *Jews* had

had. And as the *Church* of the *Jews* has been cut off, for her Disobedience to the Law of God: So (as before-mentioned) has it been said to the *Church* of *Rome* particularly, *Thou also shalt be cut off*, that is, upon the same condition, *if thou continue not in the goodness of God*, Rom. xi. 22. And we cannot imagine there should be a *Church* of *Rome* visibly as now, with a *Pope* at the Head of it, and a Number of *Bishops*, *Cardinals*, &c. under him, holding the true Christian *Faith*, when that Time comes which our Saviour has foretold, *Luke* xviii. 8. *When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find Faith on the Earth?* For then it would be found, and very visibly at *Rome*.

But that State of the Church is better Represented by the 7000 who had not bowed to *Baal*, but of whom *Elijah* knew none, but thought he was *left alone*, Rom. xi. 3, 4. This was a State of *Segregation*, there were particular Persons who kept the Faith, but Invisible to the World, or to one another; without any publick Worship, or so much as private Meetings, for *Elijah* would surely have known of these, and been the Principal among them: Far less could they have had an Organized *Church*, with *Pastors* and *Rulers* over them, without being known to *Elijah*, and to many more, even to their Persecutors; who found out the most private Recesses of the Primitive Christians, and their Meetings, though in the most secret man-

ner, for Divine Worſhip; and their Biſhops too, whom they ſeized and hauled to Priſons and to Martyrdom, for they could not lye hid, and the *Faith* was then viſible, though under Perſecution. Therefore it muſt be a much more Univerſal Depravity and Corruption of the *Church* of which our Saviour ſpoke, when Faith ſhould not be found, at leaſt viſibly, upon the Earth. It will be more like the State of the *Church* before the Flood, repreſented by the *Ark, wherein few, that is eight Souls were ſaved*, 1 Pet. 2. 20. And as the Corruption of the old World was great, we may ſuppoſe the Corruption to be greater before the ſecond coming of Chriſt, as the Deſtruction by *Fire* is more terrible than that by *Water*. However ſuch an Univerſal Corruption is here foretold, as will in no ways conſiſt with the leaſt ſort of that *Viſibility* which the Church of *Rome* requires as a Mark of the true Church, and to continue with her for ever.

But on the other hand, if there ſhall be a viſible *Church* in thoſe Days, then that *Church*, at leaſt the *Generality*, which is the *Viſibility* of it, will fall from the *Faith*, elſe it would be *viſibly* to be found upon the *Earth*; and then Men will be miſled by the *Church*, and by thoſe *Marks* of *Viſibility*, &c. which the Church of *Rome* gives her; in like manner as they were miſled by the *Church* before, when ſhe commanded them to reject their *Meſſiah*. He came firſt unto *His own*, the

Church

Church of the *Jews*, the only visible *Church* then upon the Earth, but she *received Him not*, John i. 11. for she was Corrupt and Blinded, under the Mask of Pharisaical Sanctity, and strict observance of the Law, even to the *Tything of Mint, Anniſe, and Cummin*; she was Zealous in the outward Observances, but neglected *the weightier Matters of the Law, Judgment, Mercy, and Faith*, Matth. xxiii. 23. And so it may be at the second coming of Christ, as it was at the first; for there is no more Promise of Infallibility to the one State of the Church, than to the other.

L. But it was Propheſied in the Old Testament, that the *Jews* should reject their *Messiah* at His first Coming.

G. And in the New Testament, that at His second coming *He should not find Faith upon the Earth.*

But the *Jews* did not so understand these Propheſies against themselves. They said that the *Church* was the only *Interpreter* of *Scripture*, and they must take the *Law* from the Mouth of their *Priests:* And the *Church* did interpret these *Scriptures* otherwise than *Christ* did.

L. But *Christ* being come, He was then the *Church.*

G. He was not the *Church*, for He came to Redeem the *Church.* He did not come to Redeem *Himself.* He was the *Head*, the *Church*, the *Body*; but the *Head* is not the *Body.*

Besides it is perfectly Begging the Question of the *Jews*, to suppose that *Christ* was the *Messiah*,

siah, for that they deny, and bid us prove it. That is the whole Queſtion betwixt them and us.

L. His Heavenly *Doctrine*, His *Miracles*, and the *Propheſies* of Him, prove Him to be the *Meſſiah*.

G. The *Jews* anſwer all this by the *Authority* of the *Church*, which ſaid, *Have any of the Rulers, or of the Phariſees believed on him? But this People who knoweth not the Law, are curſed.* John vii. 48, 49. And to rivet this Curſe, they *Excommunicated* thoſe who did confeſs *Chriſt*, chap. ix. 22, 34. xvi. 2. And they ſaid, That *Chriſt* wrought his *Miracles* by *Beelzebub*, Matth. ix. 34. xii. 24. And who was to be *Judge* in this Caſe, the *People* or the *Church?* Upon the Foot of the *Authority* of the *Church*, it was impoſſible at that time for any to be a *Chriſtian*. Therefore of all Men, *Chriſtians* have the leaſt reaſon to inſiſt upon this.

(14.) *L.* Then I find you reſolve all upon *private Judgment*.

G. It is all we have for the belief of a *God*, or of *Chriſt*, and, by your own Confeſſion, for the Choice of a *Church*. And then we may well truſt to it in ſmaller Matters. In ſhort, we muſt truſt to it in every thing without Exception: For it is as impoſſible to believe any thing without our *Underſtanding*, as to ſee without our *Eyes*.

L. But you believe ſome *Myſteries* which you pretend not to underſtand or explain, as the

the Doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, &c.

G. My *Reason* tells me, That there must be many things in the Nature of *God* which I cannot understand or explain, because He is Infinite and Incomprehensible. And these I take purely upon the *Revelation* that is given of them in the Holy *Scriptures*, for my own *Reason* could never have found them out, nor can perfectly understand them. They are dark to me, like a Country I never saw, I cannot have a right Idea of it till I come thither. As I cannot of *Heaven*, or of the State of separate *Souls*. Yet I cannot help framing some Conception to my self, of what I know *never entred into the Heart of Man to Conceive*, that is, aright, and according to these things are. Therefore I take not upon me to explain them, for that would be to involve my self, and I know that I must greatly Err. And yet it would be as much against *Reason* to deny these things, as to deny there was any *Country* in the World, or *Star* in the *Firmament*, which I had not seen. And much more *unreasonable*, it would be, to think there was nothing in the Nature of the *Infinite* Being which I did not comprehend: Or because that cannot be expressed to us, but in words adapted to our Understanding, therefore to measure his Nature by ours; and because *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are three Men, therefore to think that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* must be three *Gods*. But when I say *three Persons*, with relation to

the *Divine Trinity*, there comes not such a Thought in my Head as *three Persons of Men*; but because *Personal* Actions are attributed to each of the *Divine Three*, therefore we call them *Persons*, which word the *Scripture* applies to God, *Heb.* i. 3. But it is only *ad Captum*, as the Schools speak, that is, Condescending our Capacity, as when God is said to *Repent*, to *Grieve*, &c. it is not that we should think it really so, for that would be contradictory to the Nature of God; but it conveys a Notion to us, that we should act as if it were so, that God were *Angry* or *Grieved* at our Sins, and would *Repent* of the Blessings He had given or promised to us, if we took not heed to walk in His Ways which He has set before us.

(15.) *L.* I am afraid the *Deists* will think this a straining the Point in favour of *Revelation*, and say that they are much easier without it.

G. They will not find it so, when they consider that they are in no less Difficulties upon following their own *Reason* only; for Example, they allow a *first Cause* and *Creator* of all things, because nothing can make it self: And that *first Cause* must have a *necessary* Being, and consequently from all Eternity; and that *Eternity* is a *Duration* without *Succession* or *Time*, or having any *Beginning*, wherein all is *Present*, without either *Past* or *to Come*. This the *Deist* is forced to confess upon the Conviction of

his

his *Reaſon*: But he will not pretend to have ſo much as any *Idea* or *Conception* what this *Eternity* is or can be, nor can he *imagine* a *Duration* without *Beginning*, in which there is nothing *paſt*, nor any thing to *come*. Nor can he expreſs this any otherwiſe than in Words of *Time*, which he muſt own are not at all *proper* or *applicable* to it; the very word *Beginning* is inconſiſtent with *Eternity*, and to ſay *before* the *Beginning*, is a Contradiction. Here then he is loſt, and muſt have recourſe to the ſame Excuſe which he ridicules in *Revelation*, viz. That we cannot ſpeak *properly* of *God*, nor in other words than what belong to *Men*, and therefore that theſe *words* are not to be taken *ſtrictly*, nor Argued upon, or Conſequences drawn from them, for that this would involve us in numberleſs *Contradictions*. And there is not one Objection which the *Deiſt* or *Socinian* makes againſt the Doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, &c. but are of this ſort, by Arguing from the Nature of *Man* to the Nature of *God*, from the *Perſons* of the one, to the *Perſons* of the other, *&c.* Which theſe Men of *Reaſon* think highly *unreaſonable* in their own Caſe, as to argue from *Time* to *Eternity*, &c.

(16.) *L.* But, Sir, the *Deiſt* would aſk you, upon what Authority you believe that *Revelation*, viz. of the *Scriptures*? And ſince you will not have it built upon the *Authority* of

the *Church*, I see not what other *Authority* you can alledge for it.

G. Nor I neither, for I put it upon no *Authority*. It is *Evidence*, and not *Authority*, upon which my Belief of the *Scriptures* is founded.

L. Then you believe upon the *Authority* of *Evidence*.

G. That expression is not proper, though sometimes carelesly used: For *Authority* and *Evidence* are two things, if I believe a thing for your telling me so, without any other Reason, then I believe it purely upon your *Authority*; but if a Man I never saw before makes a thing very *evident* to me, and convinces my *Reason*, I believe not then upon his *Authority*, for he has none with me, but upon the *Evidence* he has given me. And what that *Evidence* is upon which we believe the Holy *Scriptures*, is set forth in a little Book I had the Honour to Present to your Lordship, Intituled, *The Truth of Christianity Demonstrated*, &c. Which was wrote to Convince *Deists*, who believe no *Church*, or any *Church Authority*. And if you have no other *Evidence* but the *Authority* of your *Church* to prove the Truth of the *Scriptures*, I see not how you will ever convince a *Deist*, who denies both.

But if I tell him that I believe the *Scriptures*, and the *Facts* therein related, upon the same, and much stronger *Evidence* than I have for believing there was such a Man

as

as *Alexander* or *Cæsar*, that there is such a Town as *Rome* or *Constantinople*, though I was never there. Yet I believe it, not upon the *Authority*, far less the *Infallibility* of any Man or Number of Men, that tell me so; but from the Nature of the *Evidence* which makes it impossible for Mankind to concert such a Lye, or to carry it on, without being Detected. And if the Truth of *Christianity*, that is, of the *Scriptures*, can be Demonstrated as plainly as these other *Facts*, (which I think is done in the Book I mentioned) then a *Deist* must either be convinced or confounded.

Now if you will let your *Church* come in as Part of the *Evidence* of *Christianity*, she will not be Refused, so far as her Share goes: But upon her *Authority*, and upon hers alone, the Truth of the *Scriptures*, and of *Christianity*, will be a Jest to the *Deists*; since her *Authority* can be proved no otherwise than by the *Scriptures*, and then back again, the *Scriptures* by her *Authority!*

L. But several Parts of the *Scriptures* have been disputed, as you reject those Books you call *Apocryphal* out of the *Canon* of the *Old Testament*: And the Antient *Hereticks* forged false *Gospels* and false *Epistles* in the Names of the Apostles: And as the Canon of the *New Testament* now stands, some of the *Epistles* have been disputed by some Learned Men. And this could not be determined, nor the *Canon* established, but by the *Authority* of the Church.

G. As

G. As to the *Apocryphal* Books, we Received the *Canon* of the *Old Teſtament* from the *Church* of the *Jews*, which never admitted them into the *Canon* of their *Scriptures*. And how ſhould we know their *Canon* better than themſelves?

Again, we are ſure they were not in the *Chriſtian Canon* in the Days of St. *Jerome*, if he knew what was Received by the *Church* as the *Canon* of *Scripture*, for in his *Prologus Galeatus*, Printed before your own *Vulgar Latin*, he rejects them as *Apocryphal*, and ſays they were not in the *Canon* of the Holy *Scriptures*.

Inter Apocrypha eſſe ponenda ------ Non ſunt in Canone.

But as to theſe Books themſelves, let any one but read the Concluſion of them, in Excuſe for the Weakneſs of the Performance, and then think it poſſible, if he can, that the *Holy Ghoſt* ſhould make ſuch a Speech as this—*If I have done well—it is what I deſired, but if ſlenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.* Or as your *Vulgar* has it, *Si quidem bene, & ut Hiſtoriæ competit, hoc & ipſe velim: Si autem minus digne, concedendum eſt mihi.* That is, *I aſk your Pardon, if I have not done my Work as it ought to be.* 2 *Machab.* xv. 38.

But as to a full Examination of the *Apocryphal* Books, and their Authority, I refer your Lordſhip to Dr. *Coſin* his *Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of the Holy Scripture.* Printed

ted 1657. And not yet answered that I can hear of.

L. But the *Canon* of the *New Testament* was established upon the Authority of the *Church.*

G. No, my Lord, not at all by her *Authority*, but plainly by *Evidence*, they proceeded wholly upon *Evidence*, *viz.* whether such an *Epistle* was sent to such a *Church*, as to the Church of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, &c. Who carefully kept the *Originals*, and sent *Copies* to other *Churches*, as was Commanded, *Col.* iv. 16. And by this Communication of the *Churches* one with another, the true *Scriptures* were known, and it is commonly set down at the end of the Epistles by what *Hand* they were sent. And by this method the *spurious Epistles* and *Gospels* forged by *Hereticks* were at first detected, as you will find in the last Chapter of the fifth Book of *Eusebius* his *Ecclesiastical History*, where it is told, That the *Hereticks* were brought to this Test, and could not produce the *Originals* whence they took their *Copies* : And that their *Copies* did vary from one another, every one adding what Opinion came into his own Head : And that they could not tell from whom they had learned such *New Doctrines.* Thus the *Canon* of the *New Testament* was settled in those Ages when these Evidences were fresh and notorious : And has been received since that time by all the Christian *Churches* in the World, so unanimously, that there is no Dispute betwixt any *Churches* concerning

cerning the *Canon* of the *New Teſtament*. And this is an *Evidence* too ſtrong for the Caprice of ſome particular Men who would ſhew their Wit in making Objections againſt this or that Part. But this cannot hurt the *Faith*, becauſe the whole *Faith* is over and over again fully Expreſſed and Contained in thoſe Goſpels and Epiſtles, which are acknowledged by all.

L. But there are various *Lections* and *Tranſlations* of the *Scriptures* into many *Languages*, which agree not exactly, and in every point, with one another. And how ſhall we examine this by *Evidence*? What *Evidence* is there in this Caſe? Here the *Authority* of the Church muſt come in to determine between theſe various *Lections* and *Tranſlations*. And theſe various *Lections* or different *Readings* of ſeveral *Texts* are very many, which ſome Learned Men have taken pains to collect.

G. But there is no difference among them in any thing material or what concerns the *Faith*. So that this inſtead of an Objection (which the *Deiſts* make uſe of to invalidate the Truth of the *Scriptures* and the Certainty of our *Faith*) proves a ſtronger Confirmation of both, in that among ſo many various *Readings* and *Tranſlations* no material Difference is found; or other than may, and without a Miracle muſt happen in ſo many thouſand *Copies* and *Impreſſions* as have been made of the *Scriptures*. And none I ſuppoſe will pretend that every *Writer* or *Printer* is *infallible*, not to miſtake a *Letter* or a *Word*, or miſplace them. But that nothing

thing of this sort has happened to the Detriment of the *Faith*, or making Disputes in any thing that is material, must be attributed to a very particular Providence.

And the Church of *Rome* has not undertaken, nor was it worth her while, to attempt the Adjusting of the various *Readings:* For in that *Translation* which she has most Approved, the *Vulgar Latin*, some of the various *Lections* are given on the Margin of her own Editions.

But what signifies the *Latin* which is not the Vulgar Language of any Nation now in the World, I say, what does this signify to the People who understand it not?

L. Therefore to answer your Objections of our locking up the *Scriptures* from the *People*, we have them now translated into the Vulgar Tongues of each Country, particularly in *France*, where they are publickly sold in the Shops.

G. This instead of an Answer to the Objection, is a confessing to it, and owning it to have been just and necessary. And thus much your People have gained by our *Reformation.*

But alas, my Lord, what have they gained? There is something worse than even a total Locking up the Scriptures in these *Translations*, that is, a *corrupting* the *Text* to deceive the People, different from even your own *Vulgar Latin* Translation, which you have authorized. This is made apparent in the Collection, printed here at *London*, of the many *Texts* thus evidently abused, both by adding to them

them and taking from them, and misinterpreting them; in the *French New Testament* printed in *France* for the use of the New Converts there. And this has occasioned the Suppression of that *New Testament*, insomuch that few of them are to be found, at least they are not publickly Sold now at *Paris*.

L. If they are suppressed, then your Complaints are answered. But have you any Objection against the *Louvain* Translation now Printed and Sold at *Paris*, with the Approbation of the Doctors and Divines there?

G. Yes, my Lord, here is one in my Hand, bought in *Rue St. Jaques* in *Paris*, where they are Printed, with the Approbations before them, in the Year 1701. And in this Translation there are many *Mistranslations*, I will shew your Lordship one; it is said, *Acts* xiii. 2. *As they ministred to the Lord.* The *Vulgar Latin* has it in the same Words, *Ministrantibus illis Domino.* But this *French* Translation is in these Words, *Or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le Sacrifice de la Messe. When they had offered to the Lord the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

L. I suppose they took that to be the Meaning of the Words.

G. Your Lordship may suppose so. But, My Lord, what the Import of the *Words is*, or what Consequences may be drawn from them, is what we call *Exposition* or *Commenting* upon the Text; but to alter the *Words* of the *Text* is of another Nature, it is false *Translation*, and not an *Interpretation*; and comes under that

that terrible Curſe pronounced *Rev.* xxii. 18, 19. againſt thoſe who add to, detract from, or pervert the Words of Holy *Scripture.*

And to ſhew that this was not done by chance, and what Uſe they intended to make of this Text thus Tranſlated, *Acts* xiii. 2. They put upon the Margin, *La Sainte Meſſe, the holy Maſs.* That the People might here find a plain *Text* of *Scripture* for the *Maſs* and the *Sacrifice* of it. And in the *Index* (which is done by the ſame Authority as the Tranſlation) upon the Word *Meſſe*, this *Text* is named as a Proof that the *Apoſtles* did celebrate *Maſs.*

This *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs* is a plain *Addition* to the *Text.* Let me give one Inſtance of *Subſtracting* from it. It is ſaid, *Heb.* xi. 21. That *Jacob worſhipped* עַל *upon* or leaning *upon the Top of his Staff.* But this *French* Tranſlation leaves out the Word עַל *upon*, and renders it that he *Worſhipped the top of his Staff. Adora le Haut de ſon Baton.* And in the *Index* at the Word *Adoration* this *Text* is quoted for the *Adoration of Wood, L'Adoration fait aux Bois.* Heb. xi. 21. Belike they thought there was ſome *Image* carved or painted on the Top of *Jacob*'s Staff which he worſhipped! And ſo this is made a *Text* for *worſhipping their wooden Images* and *Pictures!* Eſpecially the ſolemn *Worſhip* of the *Croſs* every *Good-Friday.* And who knows but that the Head of *Jacob*'s Staff was not round but Crutch-ways, ſet a-croſs (as is uſual with old Men) and then the Staff was a perfect *Croſs!*

In

In the former *Text* concerning the *Mass* this *French* Translation adds to the Words of their own *Vulgar Latin* as well as of the *Original*: But in this last, the *Vulgar Latin* as well as the *French* subtract from the *Original*, and both render this *Text* the same way.

But, to do Justice to all, the *Port Royal Bible* delivers this *Text* from the gross Interpretation put upon it, by means of a false *Translation*, to favour the *worshipping* of *Wood*.

In the other *French* Translation I mentioned before, made for the Use of the new Converts, this Expression 1 *Cor.* iii. 15. of some that shall be saved with great Difficulty, as if *passing through the Fire*, is boldly Rendred, *the fire of Purgatory*, as the *Words* of the *Text*, without any different *Character*, as is used with us when a *Word* is put in to make *English* of an *Hebrew* or *Greek* Idiom. But in this *Louvain* Translation the *Text* is let stand, *so as by fire*, only *Purgatoire* is put on the Margin in this Edition made since the Objections against the other Translation, in which the Addition of *Purgatory* to this *Text* is particularly taken notice of.

I could give your Lordship more of the *Corruptions* of *Texts* in the *French* Translations. I have now only named three, one for the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, another for the *Adoration* of the *Cross* and of *Images*, and one for *Purgatory*.

L. The *Church* is not answerable for these *Translations*, however approved and recommended by *Doctors*, *Universities*, &c.

(17.) *G.* But the *People* are deceived by them. The *People* believe as they are taught. There is small Security to them in the Abstruse Disputes concerning *Infallibility*, how far it extends, and where it is placed, and in the Disputes betwixt *Popes* and *Councils* about it. These are Questions of which I suppose your Lordship will easily grant the Common *People* are no Judges. They know nothing of the matter. How should they, when the *Learned* Men are divided among themselves concerning them? So that this *Infallibility*, if it could be found and fixed, would be of little use to the Generality of the People, unless their *Curates* and their *Fathers* and *Mothers* who instruct them, were likewise all of them *Infallible*, for as I said, they believe as they are taught, and examine no further. Nay, they are forbid to examine, for that implies a Doubt, and they are not to doubt of the Religion they are taught, but to receive, without any Doubt, what has been told them by their *Curates*, *Fathers*, *Mothers*, or *Nurses*, and what is current in the Country where they live. This is all the *Infallibility* of which they are capable. And this is the way of all the Earth. It is thus that the Generality of Mankind, whether *Heathens*, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Christians*, receive their *Religion*. And

without examining into what we have been taught, no Man could change his Religion. None could ever have become a *Chriſtian*, eſpecially no *Jew*, who had the *Authority* of his *Church* againſt *Chriſt*, to which *Church* he alledges Promiſes of *Perpetuity* and *Infallibility*.

(18.) *L.* The Biſhop of *Meaux* has cleared this in his Conference with Mr. *Cloud*. Where the Biſhop aſſerts the Neceſſity of a *Living Infallible Judge* always in being to direct Men. And ſays, that when Chriſt was come, He was that *Living Judge*, and ſo the Authority of the *Jewiſh Church* was ſuperſeded.

G. This is *Gratis dictum* and begging the Queſtion of the *Jew*, as I have ſaid already, who upon the Authority of his *Church*, denies our *Chriſt* to have been the *Meſſiah*. I will not repeat, only aſk theſe few Queſtions further. 1. Who was this *Living Judge* before the *Flood?* For the Biſhop ſays there muſt be always ſuch an one in being. 2. Was *Abraham*, who was known only to a few Neighbours, and wrought no *Miracles* to convince others, was he, I ſay, given as ſuch a *Guide* or *Judge* to the whole *Earth?* And *Chriſt* was not ſo great a Traveller as *Abraham*. 3. Where was this *Living Judge* when *Chriſt* was Dead? And if there was none for three Days, it might be ſo for three, or three hundred Years, or for good and all, becauſe

the

the Argument fails for the *Neceſſity* of ſuch a *Judge* always in being. You will not ſay the *Church* can fail for three Days. The Promiſes of God can never fail, no not for a Moment.

L. *Chriſt* founded His *Church* before He died, and left his *Apoſtles* for Guides, chiefly *Peter* the Prince and Principle of Unity to them all.

G. And yet of the *Apoſtles*, one *betrayed* Him, another *forſwore* Him (and that was *Peter*) all *forſook* Him.

L. That was human Frailty, and Perſonal. But they retained the true *Faith*, they were in no Error as to that.

G. The greateſt that could be, F*or as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He muſt riſe again from the Dead.* John xx. 9. *And if Chriſt be not Raiſed, your Faith is vain: ye are yet in your Sins*, 1 Cor. xv. 17. And the Reaſon given for chooſing *Matthias* into the room of *Judas* was, *That he might be a witneſs with the other Apoſtles of the Reſurrection of Chriſt.* Acts i. 22. And what *Faith* could they have in Him whom they had quite given over, and never expected to ſee him more? *They truſted that it had been He who ſhould have redeemed Iſrael*, Luke xxiv. 21. But when He was Dead, all their Hopes were gone, they expected no Redemption from Him. This was far from a *Chriſtian Faith*, and could there be a *Chriſtian Church* without this *Faith?*

To avoid all this, and secure the Promise of *Indefectibility*, to the *Church*, some of your Authors of greatest Name have said, that the *Church* was then preserved in the Virgin *Mary*. And thence infer that the *Catholick Church* may be preserved in one *Woman*, as it was then, and that so it may be again, in the times of *Anti-christ*, and the great *Defection* is fotetold will be before the *second Coming* of *Christ*, when *Faith shall not be found upon the Earth*, that is very hardly, when it may be confined to one *Laick*, a *Woman*, or a Baptized *Infant*, as others of your Doctors allow.

Bannes com. in 2. 2. Quest. In Art. 10. Dub. i.

L. This is giving up the *Church* quite, as a *Society*, with *Government*, *Discipline*, &c. and I hardly believe any of our approved Authors have said so much, and not been censured for it.

G. They are no less Men than *Alensis*, the Author of the *Glos* upon the *Decretals*, *Lyra*, *Occam*, *Alliaco*, *Panormitan*, *Turrecremata*, *Peter de Monte*, St. *Antoninus*, *Cusanus*, *Clemangis*, *Jacobatius*, *J. Fr. Picus*, &c. And to save Repetition, your Lordship will find their Books and Words quoted, in this small Treatise in my Hand intituled, *The incurable Scepticism of the Church of* Rome, printed here 1688. *p.* 22. *&c.* I name this little Tract, because it is short, and will give your Lordship no great trouble, and proceeds upon the same Argument I have undertaken with your Lordship, instead of the particular points in

Dispute

Diſpute betwixt the Church of *Rome* and us, as *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, &c. to go at once to the bottom of the Cauſe, and examine the Ground and Foundation of *Faith*, as taught in the Church of *Rome*; which is ſhewed, I think to a Demonſtration, to be wholly precarious and uncertain: And that there is no greater Difference and Confuſion among any ſort of Men, upon any Subject whatſoever, than there is among the Divines of the Church of *Rome*, concerning her *Rule* of *Faith*, and *Infallible Judge* of *Controverſy*. And every one of the different Opinions about it, is in flat Contradiction to all the others, ſo that if any one of them be true, all the reſt muſt be falſe: And yet they all pretend to believe with *Divine Faith*, and think it neceſſary in this caſe, becauſe it is the *Foundation* of their *Faith*.

Now if according to theſe Learned Doctors, the whole *Church* failed upon our Saviour's Death, then the *Gates of Hell* did prevail for a time. And if the Virgin *Mary* were excepted, that would not do much as to the Standing of the *Church*. But have they any *Revelation*, to ground *Divine Faith* upon, or upon what Grounds do they believe, that the Virgin *Mary* knew the *Scriptures*, or the *Reſurrection of Chriſt*, more than the *Apoſtles*, and was not under the ſame Deſpondency as they were? This ſeems to be that *Sword* which *Simeon* told her, ſhould *pierce through her own Soul alſo*, Luke ii. 35.

L. To avoid all these things, some suppose, That the *Christian Church* was not formed till the Descent of the *Holy Ghost* at *Pentecost*, when *Peter* converted about 3000, as told in the 2d of the *Acts*. And that it was of this *Christ* spoke, when He told *Peter* that He would build His *Church* upon him, and called him a *Rock*, and that it was fulfilled at this time, when *Peter* was made the Instrument of that first and great Conversion, which was the Foundation of all that followed.

G. If the *Christian Church* was not formed, as some think, till after the *Resurrection*, because our Redemption was not till then compleated: Or, as others think, till the *Ascension*, when *Christ* commissioned his *Apostles* to *go and teach all Nations*, Matth. xxviii. 19. Or till the Descent of the *Holy Ghost*, when they were *endued with Power from on High*. Luke xxiv. 49. Yet any of these ways it will follow that there was no *Christian Church* before the *Death* of *Christ*. And then that the *Jewish* was the only true *Church* while *Christ* lived in the World. For the *Jewish* Church was to last till the *Christian* was formed, else there was no *Church* at all after *Christ* came, till His *Resurrection*. And then it would follow, that the only True *Church* in the World did reject our *Christ*. And then there will be no Choice left us, but either to acknowledge the *Fallibility* of the *Church*, or to reject *Christ* from being the *Messiah*. But if the *Christian Church* was formed upon the first Appearance of *Christ* in the World,

World, or upon his Ordaining the Twelve *Apoſtles*, and ſending them out to preach, or upon any other Act done in his Life; then, as ſaid before, the whole *Church* failed upon His *Death*. But if the *Church* cannot fail, no not for a Moment, becauſe of the *Neceſſity* of a *Living Infallible Judge* always in being, the *Succeſſion* of the *Monarchy* of the *Church* ought to be *Hereditary*, where the *King never Dies*: For this *Scheme* will not admit of an *Inter-Regnum* for *Months* or *Years* that may be ſpent in the Election of a *Pope*, in all which time the *Church* has no *Head* or *Monarch*. Much leſs when there are *Popes* and *Anti-Popes*, which has occaſioned 26 Schiſms in the *Church* of *Rome*, ſome of them of long Continuance. And who is *Judge* in ſuch a Caſe? Is every Man left to his own *private Judgment*. And is it all one which of the Contending *Popes* he adheres to, whether to the *Right* or the *Wrong*? Or can the *Church* have two or three oppoſite *Heads* at the ſame time?

L. Therefore in *France*, where I received my Education, they place not the *Infallibility* in the *Pope*, but in a *General Council*.

G. I told your Lordſhip before, that there never was a *Council* truly *General*. That there are Diſputes in your *Church* concerning *General Councils*, ſome receiving thoſe, or Parts of them which others reject. And who ſhall be *Judge* in this Caſe?

But ſuppoſe you were agreed among your ſelves concerning your *Councils*, and that they

were *Infallible*, yet they are not a *living Judge* always in being; you have not had one since that of *Trent*, which began in the Year 1545, and concluded in the Year 1563. Now 150 Years ago. And there may not be another in twice that time, if ever. Where then is the *living Judge always in being*, which the *Bishop* of *Meaux* and others think necessary?

L. General Councils may in this Sense be called *Living*, and *always in being*, that their *Canons* are *always in being*, and determin *Controversies* to those who regard them. And if new *Heresies*, or *Controversies*, or *Schisms* of *Popes* arise, new *Councils* may be called to Determin them.

G. And Ages may pass before that can be done. And the *Church* may be corrupted in the mean time for want of such a *living Judge*. As *Europe* is now situated it would be pretty difficult to have a *General Council*. And it may be long enough before any *Pope* may be of Opinion to call one, or hazard his *Supremacy* upon it.

(19.) But, My Lord, the *Canons* of Past *Councils* are not *Living*, nor can speak for themselves. There are Volumes Printed of the Learned in your own Communion giving contrary Expositions of the *Canons*. I will Instance in one, the Third Canon of the Fourth, commonly called the *Great Council* of *Lateran*, acknowledged to be a true *General Council* by all of the Church of *Rome*, established in most express and positive Terms, the *Pope*'s Power

of

of Depoſing *Princes*, and *Abſolving* their *Subjects* from their *Allegiance*, not only if he pleaſe to call them *Hereticks* themſelves, but if they do not Extirpate all *Hereticks* out of their *Dominions*. This is maintained in the literal Senſe by *Bellarmin* and the *Italian* Doctors. On the other hand, the *Gallican* Church who have Condemned the *Depoſing* Doctrine, and yet own this Council of *Lateran*, are put to hard Shifts, and many Diſtinctions to Solve this, but it is impoſſible, for either that Doctrine muſt be true, or this *Council* has greatly Erred.

L. But not in *Faith*. This is no Matter of *Faith*.

G. But is it not Matter of *Salvation*, for which we ſhall be Judged at the laſt Day? St. *Paul* ſays, *Rom.* xiii. 2. *They that reſiſt the* (Lawful) *Powers, ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation——Wherefore* (ſays he, *Ver.* 5.) *Ye muſt needs be Subject, not only for Wrath* (or fear of temporal Puniſhment from theſe Powers) *but alſo for Conſcience ſake*, that is, towards *God*. And what are theſe *Guides of Conſcience* who lead us *wrong* in this? In the Deſcription of the *laſt Judgment* given by *Chriſt*, Matth. xxv. 31. to the end, Men ſhall be Judged chiefly for their *Practice*. There is nothing mentioned there but what Men have *done*. And have we no *Guide* as to *Practice*, while we raiſe ſuch Contentions about a *Guide* in *Faith*? Or is the *Church* a *Guide* in *Practice* too? And is a *General Council* the *Church*. Then the *Church* has led us into a damnable *Practice*, un-

le ſ

leſs the *Pope* has Power to Depoſe *Princes* at his Pleaſure, and that there is no Sin in *Rebellion*, and all the *Blood* and *Deſolation* that follow it, if his *Holineſs* ſo Command !

L. But the Church does not oblige us to *profeſs* or *ſubſcribe* the *Depoſing* Doctrine, no, nor to *believe* it, ſo that you may be a good *Roman Catholick*, notwithſtanding all this. Nay you may *oppoſe* the *Depoſing* Doctrine, as the *Clergy* of *France* do.

G. And may I not be as good a *Roman Catholick* if I do *believe* it, and *defend* it, and *practice* it too ? And have I not all the Encouragement the *Church* of *Rome* can give me, the frequent *Practice* of the *Popes* themſelves, and here the Canon of a *General Council* for it ? And have any of the *Popes* ever yet Renounced it ?

L. But the Doctors do not agree about the Senſe of that *Canon.* You ſee *France* takes it in a quite contrary Senſe from the *Pope* and *Italian* Doctors.

G. Then your Lordſhip ſees that *Canons* are but a *dead Letter*, and that there may be Diſputes about them. And where then is the *Living Infallible Judge* always in being ? You ſee the *Canons* of former *Councils* cannot be this *Judge.* There muſt be another *Judge* to determine what the true *Senſe* of them is. And who ſhould that *Judge* be but the *Pope* the *Head* of the *Church ?* I am ſure if I were a *Roman Catholick* I ſhould be on that Side. I could ſhew Your Lordſhip ſeveral other *Canons* of

Councils

Councils that are in Diſpute among your own Doctors; but that can be no Wonder, when I have already ſhewed, they are in Diſpute about the *Council* themſelves. So that there is no Certainty, what the Judgment of your *Church* is. Or rather it is certain that it is moſt Erroneous, and in Matters that concern our Eternal Salvation, as well as the *Peace* of the *World*, that is, *Rebellion* (among other things) which is as *Witchcraft* and *Idolatry*. I have Inſtanced in this *Sin*, becauſe I know Your Lordſhip to be tenacious of your Loyalty.

And now, My Lord, ſince the Saving of our Souls is the End for our being of any *Church*, I leave Your Lordſhip to Judge, whether the People are ſafeſt in the Communion of *Rome*, or of the Church of *England*, as to this Point?

(20.) *L.* They are ſafe in the Church of *France*, where the *Depoſing* Doctrine is diſowned.

G. My Lord, our Diſpute is with the Church of *Rome*. And if the Church of *France* differs from the Church of *Rome*, in Matters whereon our *Salvation* depends, they cannot be ſaid to be *one Church*, or to have the ſame Guides to *Heaven*.

But, My Lord, the *Pope*'s Depoſing Power has extended it ſelf even to *France*, of which you will find frequent Inſtances in their Hiſtories. And even ſo late as the *Holy League* againſt

gainſt *Hen.* III. all the Popes in that time joined with the *League* againſt the King, and ſupported that *Rebellion* by their Authority. And the Generality of the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* of *France*, and their *Univerſities* took part with the *League*, and juſtified it by Principle and in Print, the Book *de juſta Abdicatione* Henrici III. *Of the juſt* Abdication *of* Hen. III. *King of* France, was then wrote upon the foot of the *Depoſing* Power, not only of the Pope but alſo of the *People*. And *D'Avila* in his Hiſtory of theſe Civil Wars in *France* tells, *A great and Solemn Proceſſion was made by Order from the Cardinal Legat, to implore God's Aſſiſtance* (for the Succeſs of the *League* againſt the *King*) *in which the* Prelates, *Prieſts, and Monks of the ſeveral* Religious *Orders, walked all in their accuſtomed Habits; but beſides them, Armed openly with* Corſlets, *Guns, Swords,* Partiſans, *and all kind of Arms Offenſive and Defenſive, making at once a double Shew, both of Devotion, and* Conſtancy *of Heart to defend themſelves. Which* Ceremony *though to many it ſeemed Undecent and* Ridiculous, *yet was of great uſe to augment and confirm the* Courage *of the common* People.

D'Avila. *Hiſt. of the Civil Wars of* France. *Engliſh* Tranſlation. Printed in the *Savoy*, 1678. *Lib.* xi. *Pag.* 459.

And the *Cardinal-Legat* ſays in the *Declaration* he Publiſhed to the *Leaguers*, that to acknowledge an *Heretick* for their *King*, *is the Dream of a*

Ibid. Lib. xiii. p. 578.

a Mad-man, which proceeds from nothing else but Heretical Contagion.

And the *Leaguers* shew wherein they placed their Confidence, and say, *They are the most holy Fathers* (the Popes) *and the most Holy See that have sent us Relief: And though many have been called to that supreme Dignity* (of the Popedom) *since these last Troubles, yet hath there not been one of them who hath changed his Affection towards us: A most certain Testimony that our Cause is Just.* Ibid. p. 598.

And there had been *Six Popes* during the *League*, viz. *Gregory* XIII. *Sixtus* V. *Urban* VII. *Gregory* XIV. *Innocent* IX. and *Clement* VIII. And they supported that *Rebellion*, not only with their *Blessing* it and the Authors of it, and *Cursing* the *King* and all the *Loyal* Subjects who Adhered to him; but they sent more substantial Relief, *viz.* 300000 Crowns for the Service of the Cardinal of *Bourbon*, whom they had chosen *King*, by the Name of *Charles* the *Tenth*, against the next in Blood, only because he was a *Protestant*; and 15000 Crowns a Month to carry on that *Rebellion*, with an Army of 6000 Foot, and 1200 Horse to Assist these *Holy Leaguers*. The *Pope* went Heart and Hand into this Work, *Which he accounted excellently Good* (says *D'Avila*) *and of wonderful Glory and Advancement to the Apostolick See.* And afterwards, when the Success of the *King's* Arms had induced several of the Ibid. Lib. xii. p. 493, 501, 503. Lib. xi. p. 431.

Clergy

Clergy and others to come over to him, the *Pope* sent his *Monitory Letters* to the *Prelates* and *Catholicks*, commanding them *under Pain of Excommunication, and of being deprived of their Dignities and Benefices, and of being used as Sectaries and Hereticks, that they should withdraw themselves from those Places that yeilded Obedience to* Henry *of* Bourbon (so he stiled the King) *and from the Union and Fellowship of his Faction.* And the Authority of the *Pope* prevailed so far at last, That those *Catholicks* who had joined with the *King* formed a *Conspiracy* against him, upon his Delay of changing his Religion, wherein the *Princes of the Blood* were most violent, and told him plainly to his Face, that if he did not perform his Promise (to turn *Roman Catholick*) they would Desert him, and join with the *League*. See *D'Avila*, p. 611, 612, as likewise, 555, 601, and 605.

Lib. xiii. p. 613.

After his Conversion, and being by that Established upon the Throne, they feared his Power, and therefore the *Pope* (as now) made less Noise with the *Deposing* Doctrine, which yet he would not disown, but keep it *in Petto* till a more fitting Opportunity. But yet it was not carried so Covertly, but that, even in their Sermons, wise and willing Men might know their Meaning. *Ravaillac* upon his Examination, alleged the

See King *James* I. his *Defence of the Right of Kings* against Cardinal *Perron*, p. 4.

the *Lent Sermons* before his Assassination of King *Hen.* IV. as the Ground and Encouragement to that Execrable Fact. But after that Magnanimous Prince had thus fallen a Sacrifice to their Restless furious Zeal, and his Son succeeded Young and Fenceless to the Government then they set up again the *Deposing* Doctrine on High, because then they durst do it. With which our King *James* does justly Upbraid them, particularly his Opponent the Cardinal of *Perron*, in the *Preface* to his Book quoted on the Margin. For it was but Five Years after the Murder of *Henry* IV. *viz.* An. 1615, that Cardinal *Perron* in the Assembly of the *Three Estates* of *France*, and in the Name of the *First Estate*, that is of the *Clergy*, did Re-assert the Power of the *Pope* to Depose *Kings*, with this Reason, that otherwise, *There had not been any Church for many Ages past*; *and that indeed the Church* (he meant of *Rome*) *was the very Synagogue of Anti-christ.*

But to come to a fresh Instance now on foot, the *Pere Juvency* a *French Jesuit* has lately Printed a Book at *Rome* in Defence of the *Pope*'s Power to Depose *Princes*: And the Unwillingness and Shifts of the *Jesuits* at *Paris* to disown him in this, and to disclaim that Doctrine fairly and above Board, shews that it is not yet quite extinguished in *France*, but kept in the Embers, as in the Reign of *Henry* IV. For all who Understand that *Order* of the *Jesuits*, know full well

that

that none of them dare *Print*, especially upon such a Subject, without the Approbation of their Superiors. However it is Plain by this, that the *Deposing* Doctrine is still Countenanced at *Rome*. And that *France* is not intirely free from the Infection. And though the Vigor of the present *King* has depressed it very much, we cannot say it is totally extinguished, or that there is no Danger of a Relapse, while the Authority of the *Pope* is so Revered as *Head* of the *Catholick Church*, and this Council of *Lateran* is still owned as truly *General* and *Infallible*. And the *Bishops* of *France* still take an *Oath of Fidelity* and *Obedience* to the *Pope*.

L. But that *Oath* is not Inconsistent with their *Fidelity* to their *King*.

G. Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, is not an *Oath* to be taken in the known and declared Sense of the *Imposer*, for whose Security it is taken?

L. Yes surely, for otherwise all such *Oaths* would be Equivocal, and no Security at all.

G. Then the Question will be, what the *Pope* means by the *Regalia* of St. *Peter*, and all the *Rights*, *Prerogatives*, &c. of the *Apostolick Chair*, as he calls his own, to which these *Bishops* are Sworn, *contra omnem hominem*, against every Man or Power in the World. For it is the *Pope* who imposes this *Oath*, and it is taken for its Security. And has he not sufficiently declared what he means by

by it? Take it in the Words of *the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, in the *Appendix*, p. 44. where they say, *That by this Decree* (of the *Bulla in Cœna Domini*) *the Popes declare themselves Soveraign Monarchs of the World.* And this is no more than is given them at their *Coronation*, as you have it in the *Roman Pontifical*, where the *Triple Crown* is put upon the *Pope's* Head with these Words, *Receive this Diadem adorned with three Crowns: And know your self to be Father of Princes and Kings; Governor of the World: And Vicar upon Earth of our Saviour* Jesus Christ. And must not this *Governor* of the *World* have *Power* to *Dethrone* all petty *Kings* and *Princes* that are under him? Else how can he Govern the *World*? And the *Popes* think that this their *Soveraign* Power of Deposing *Princes* is fully Recognized to them in the foresaid *Canon* of the *Council* of *Lateran.* And no *Pope* has ever yet been brought to disown this Power. So far from it, that the *Pope* who most of any other Asserted this *Bulla in Cœna*, and set it up on High, causing it to be Affixed and Published, not only at the Doors of the Churches in *Rome*, but in the Field of *Flora*, that all might take notice, as you find at the end of the *Bull*, p. 37. *Appen.* And who practised his *Deposing* Power (the last in *England*) upon Queen *Elizabeth*, Absolving her Subjects from their Allegiance, and Commanding all

Accipe Thyaram Tribus Coronis ornatam: Et scias te esse Patrem Principum & Regum: Rectorem Orbis: In Terra Vicarium Salvatoris nostri *Jesu Christi.*

the *Catholicks* in *England* to pay her no more *Obedience*, nor *Taxes*, &c. I say this same *Pope* has been pick'd out to be *Canonized* for a *Saint*, the very last Summer, 1712, by the present *Pope*, with all the Solemnity and Requisites in the Church of *Rome* for making a *Saint*. And this present *Pope*, as well as his Predecessors, does, every Year, Thunder out the *Excommunications* of this *Bulla in Cœna*, by *Bell*, *Book*, *and Candle*, which, like *Dracansor*, cuts down *Friends* and *Foes*; for there never was a *Roman Catholick King* in *England*, or in any other Kingdom, either before the *Reformation* or since, but is *Excommunicated* by this *Bull*, and by the 24th Article, past the Power even of the *Pope* to Absolve him, unless he first Abrogate and Annul all the *Laws* of his Country which are contrary to the Tenor of this *Bull*. And this never yet was done, and I dare say never will be done, in any *Popish* Country in *Europe*, and there is not, nor ever was any *Popish* Country in any other Part of the World, unless you will except the late *Spanish* Plantations in *America*. And not only the *Kings* themselves, but all their *Parliaments*, *Councellors*, *Judges*, *Officers*, even to *Printers* or *Publishers*, or any whosoever that *either directly or indirectly*, *tacitely or expressly*, *Violate*, *Depress*, *or Restrain the Ecclesiastical Liberties or Rights of the Apostolick See and holy Church of* Rome, *howsoever and whensoever obtained*, *or to be obtained*, are all here together *Excommunicated*, as likewise all *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, and *Clergy*, who shall do the same

ſame, and all who ſhall preſume to attempt any Oppoſition or Contravention to any thing contained in this *Bull*, are left under the *Diſpleaſure of Almighty God, and of His bleſſed Apoſtles*, Peter *and* Paul, which is the concluding *Sanction* of this *Bull*. And here *Saints* muſt be joined with *God*, leſt His Diſpleaſure ſhould not be ſufficient. By all this it appears, That there is hardly any *Roman Catholick* in the World above the Condition of a Plow-man, who is not *Excommunicated* by this *Bull*. And here you ſee plainly the *Pope* aſſuming a *Temporal* or *Civil* Power over all *Emperors*, *Kings*, and *Princes*, Limiting them by Artic. 5. as to the raiſing *Taxes* upon their own *Subjects*, without his expreſs Licenſe; and exempting all *Eccleſiaſticks* from being any way *Taxed* by them. *Artic.* 18. Or being under their Power, even in *Civil* or *Criminal* Cauſes, as by *Artic.* 19. though it were *Treaſon*, *Murder*, &c. for which noble Principle *Thomas Becket*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was *Canonized*, for Maintaining the Liberties of *Holy Church!*

Now, My Lord, I leave it to your ſelf, whether if you were a *King*, you would deſire all the *Biſhops* of your Kingdom to be under an *Oath* of *Fidelity* to another, who pretended an *Abſolute* and *Civil* Power over you, with Authority to *Depoſe* you, as he had done to ſeveral of your Predeceſſors, and would by no means be brought to Diſclaim ſuch his Power, but on the contrary, made a freſh Claim of it every Year, and of his being the *Soveraign*

Monarch of the *World?* Nay, he puts in his Claim for more, if more can be thought of, as it is Worded in the *Bulla in Cœna.* Artic. 24. *All the Rights of the Apoſtolick See and Holy Church of* Rome, *howſoever and whenſoever obtained or to be obtained* —— *Howſoever obtained*, that is, You are not to enquire whether *Right* or *Wrong:* And *Whenſoever*, that is, You are not to go back to *Antiquity*, or the *Inſtitution*, or look further than the preſent *Poſſeſſion*, which with him gives *Right*, when it is for him. And *to be obtained*, ſecures any new Acquiſitions he can make, and all his future *Pretences.* This is like Swearing *Et cætera's.* And now I think the *Plenitude* of his *Power* is ſufficiently Guarded! And all this is included in the *Regalia* of St. *Peter*, and the *Rights* of the *Roman* Church, to which the *Biſhops* of *France*, as well as of other *Popiſh* Countries are *Sworn*, if they take that *Oath* ſincerely, that is, according to the known and declared *Senſe* of the *Impoſer.*

(21.) *L.* But I ſuppoſe this *Oath* muſt have been taken away, if that Model of *Church Government* had gone on which was propoſed by the Parliament of *Paris* (and no doubt with the *King*'s Approbation) that a *Council* of the *Biſhops*, &c. in *France* ſhould be conſtituted by His Majeſty to diſpoſe of vacant *Biſhopricks*, &c. and determine all *Eccleſiaſtical* Matters, without any Appeal or Recourſe to *Rome.*

G. And it had gone on, but for the Succeſs of that *Confederacy* formed by Pope *Innocent* XI. againſt

againſt the King of *France*, to Re-eſtabliſh his *Supremacy* there. In order to which he ſent a *Nuncio* to our late King *James* to invite him to be Head of that *Confederacy*. But he who had learnt no other than *French* Popery, abſolutely refuſed, and oppoſed the Encroachments of the *Pope's Supremacy*, as appears plainly by his Concurrence with Monſieur *Barillon* the *French Ambaſſador*, then reſiding with him, to cauſe the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris againſt the Pope's Supremacy, hereunto Annexed, to be Tranſlated into *Engliſh*, and Printed at *London* in the Year 1688, which was his laſt of Reigning here. And the *Pope* had this for his Excuſe, that he could not otherwiſe have carried on his *Confederacy*, than by concerting the *Depoſition* of King *James*. Who would not have agreed to the *firſt* of the *Articles* Sworn at the *Hague* by the *Princes*, *Allies*, and *Confederates*, in *February*, 1691, and Printed here at that time, *viz. That no Peace be made with* Lewis XIV, *till he has made Reparation to the Holy See, for whatſoever he has acted againſt it; and till he Annul and make void all thoſe Infamous Proceedings againſt the Holy Father*, Innocent XI. Theſe are *the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris hereunto annexed. And in the Treaty of K. *William* with *Spain*, bearing Date *Dec.* 31, 1690. it is ſtipulated, *Art.* 4. *That all things in the Eccleſiaſticks* (in *France*) *ſhould be reſtored as in their former State.*

Now if King *James* would not come in to theſe things, was there not ſufficient Reaſon

for the *Pope* to exercise his *Deposing* Power against him, in the best manner that he could? And if he had such *Power* from *God*, then King *James* had no Injury to complain of as done to him, being *Deposed* by his Lawful *Superior*.

L. You recal to my Mind the Astonishment we were in here at the cold Reception, and even Slights put upon the Earl of *Castlemain*, Ambassador of King *James* at *Rome*, while a *Protestant Doctor*, no ways acceptable there upon his own Account, and some others, were Caressed in an extraordinary manner. But the Event of things explains their Conduct. And now we see the Reason why *Innocent* XI. was then called here the *Protestant Pope*, because he took part against King *James*, and helped on the *Revolution*. And I have been told, That at that time the *Pope* did require of King *James* his Promise to use his Endeavours to have the *Oath of Supremacy* taken away in *England*. And that His Majesty did positively refuse it, which some of us wondered at here. But that another did Promise it, and in this, was as good as his Word, and has taken this Stumbling-block out of the Way.

G. King *James* his Fate was very hard, he was Abdicated in *England*, because he was a *Papist*: And the Pope wrought his *Deposition*, because he was too much a *Protestant*. And such *Protestants* are the *French* reckoned at *Rome*, they are called there *Heretici Tolerati*, *Tolerated Hereticks*. Nor would they be *Tolerated*, if the *Pope* could help it, that is, if he durst

durſt imitate the Example of his Predeceſſor, the new Saint, Pope *Pious* V. to Depoſe the *Soveraign*, Abſolve the *Subjects* from their *Allegiance*, and *Interdict* the *Kingdom*. But that Experiment proved ſo fatal to the *Pope* in *England*, that it is not likely it will ever be tryed again, either in *France*, or any where elſe. The Thunder of the Vatican is ſpent, and become a *Brutum Fulmen*. The *Emperor* keeps *Commacchio* ſtill, notwithſtanding it is particularly named, by the *Latin* Name *Comaclum*, in the *Bulla in Cœna*. The 2d Article Damns all who Appeal from the *Pope* to a future *Council*: Yet have we ſeen it done in Form by the *King* of *France* and the *Parliament* of *Paris*, and that very *Bull* named, and thrown off without any Regard. And the whole *Gallican Church* are under this *Excommunication* in almoſt all the Articles of it, by the four memorable *Propoſitions*, here annexed, which were Eſtabliſhed in the *General Aſſembly* of their *Biſhops* and *Clergy* in the Year 1682, upon which the *Pope* refuſed his *Bull* to the *Biſhops* there, as is complained of in the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, and was the Ground of their Quarrel with Pope *Innocent* XI. And the Learned *du Pin* wrote his Treatiſe before mentioned *de la Puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique*, &c. in Defence of theſe *Propoſitions* againſt all the Objections of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*.

L. You ſhould have ſaid the *Court* of *Rome*.

G. I underſtand not the Diſtinction. If you mean nothing by the *Church* of *Rome* but a

General Council, then there is no *Church* of *Rome* now in the World, but if there be a *Church* of *Rome*, where ſhall we look for it but at *Rome?* And what is it there but the *Pope* and his *Cardinals?* And is not that it which you call the *Court* of *Rome*. Where then is the Difference?

L. We own the *Pope* to be the *Firſt and the Chief of the Biſhops*, and as ſuch keep Communion with him, as it is ſaid in the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, p. 51.

G. The *Precedence* of *Biſhops* is not a Matter of that Conſequence as to break the *Peace* of the *Church* for it, or which of them ſhould be *Preſident* in a *Council*. If that were all the Difference, the *Biſhop* of *Rome* ſhould have it with all my Heart, or any other *Biſhop* they ſhould agree upon. And if this were all that is meant by the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, we ſhould not trouble the World much about it. But he will not be content with any ſuch thing. The *Supremacy* he claims is no leſs than an abſolute *Soveraignty* over all the *Churches* and *Kingdoms* of the Earth, their *Biſhops* and their *Kings*: And this not by any *Eccleſiaſtical* Conſtitution, or Grant of Temporal *Princes*, which might be Conditional, Limited, and Revocable; and would infer their Superiority to him: But by a *Divine* and *Indefeaſible* Right, as Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, and Heir of all the Promiſes made to him, *Unalterable*, *Unlimitable*, and *Unaccountable* to any *Power* upon *Earth*.

L. What-

L. Whatever he means by his *Supremacy*, we mean no such thing, or other than that he is the *First* or *Chief of the Bishops*, and as such, think our selves obliged to keep *Communion* with him.

G. But when he means one thing by his *Supremacy*, and you mean another, and he has sufficiently declared what he means by it, and requires your owning it and *swearing* to it, for his Security. Who deal most sincerely with him, we who not believing any such *Supremacy* in him, will neither *own* it nor *swear* to it: Or you, who not believing it more than we, in the Sense you know he means it, yet own it in General Terms, but in a quite contrary Sense to what you know he means, and trusts to as his Security? We *Disown* it, and Fight against it: You Fight against it as much as we, yet seem to *own* it.

L. But though we differ from the Pope upon the Point of his *Supremacy*, yet we keep *Communion* with him.

(24.) *G.* Is not *Excommunication* putting a Man out of *Communion?*

L. Yes, for so is the Word *Ex-communicate*, that is, to put out of *Communion.*

G. Can a Man be said then to be in the *Communion* of a *Bishop* who has *Ex-communicated* him?

L. No, I think not, else *Ex-communication* signifies nothing.

G. Then

G. Then none can be truly ſaid to be in *Communion* with the *Pope* who are *Excommunicated* by every Year, in the *Bulla in Cœna:* And that is all *France*, and you, My Lord, and all who are on your ſide of the Queſtion concerning the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, for that is the Main, almoſt the only Subject of that *Bull.*

L. But all Caſuiſts do agree, that an *Excommunication* does not bind, which is made *Clave Errante*, that is, where the Judge paſſes Sentence through *Miſ-information*, *Inadvertence* or of *Malice*, *Self-deſigns*, or other Siniſter Motive; in theſe the *Judge* has *erred*, and alſo where he has *exceeded* his *Authority*, and *extended* it to things that are not ſubject to it; in theſe Caſes the Sentence is unjuſt, and will not be ratified in Heaven.

G. But who is *Judge* whether the Sentence be pronounced *Clave Errante* or not? And how far the *Pope*'s Authority does extend: He has *Excommunicated* you, All of you, *as if each one were particularly named*, for ſo it is expreſſed in the *Bull.* On the other hand, you deſpiſe this *Bull*, and ſay, with the *Parliament of Paris*, p. 44, 45. That he has hereby *Excommunicated* himſelf! And ſo you have a *Head* of the *Church* who is *Excommunicated!* And ſo of every *Pope* who gives his *Sanction* to this *Bull*, that is, all the *Popes* in our time, and long before. And from whoſe *Communion* is the *Pope* of *Rome* Excommunicated? Is there any other *Communion* but that of *Rome?* Is a Perſon *Excommunicated* no longer a *Member* of the *Church*? And can he then

be

be the *Head* of it? These are Matters of no small Importance, no less than whether we are *Members* of the *Church*, or cut off from it? You are cut off, says the *Pope* and *Church* of *Rome*. No, says *France* to them, you your selves are cut off. And yet these Two *Churches* are the same! And is there no *Judge* in this Case? Is every Man left to his own *private Judgment*? How then have we been Teazed with that Question, *Who shall be Judge*? This answers all Objections with you; for begin at what Point of *Popery* we will, and bring Arguments never so Convincing, we are always stopt with this Question, *Who shall be Judge*? And so you refer all to the Authority of your *Church*. But when you Answer this as to your own Case, you will have Answered it as to us too.

If the *Pope* is *Supreme Head* of the *Universal Church*, he must have Power of *Excommunication* over all in his own *Communion*, that is, according to his *Scheme*, over all *Christians* in the World. And to dispute the Validity of his *Excommunication*, is a total Denial of his *Supremacy*, and setting up another *Supreme* above him. And who is that? Who is *Judge* whether his *Excommunication* is valid, or not? And by what *Authority* does he *judge*? It must be by some Authority *Superior* to that of the Pope. And so he is *Supreme* over the *Supreme*.

But if the *Pope's Excommunication* stands (without which his *Supremacy* falls) we may say, *who then can be saved*? All the Christian

Kings

Kings and *Princes* that are or ever were in the World, even thoſe of his own Communion, particularly in *England*, as well before the *Reformation* as ſince, are all together *Curſed* and *Anathematized* to the Pit of Hell, by the *Bulla in Cœna*; and with them, all their *Biſhops*, *Divines*, *Parliaments*, *Judges*, *Lawyers*, *Clerks*, *Printers* and *Publiſhers*, or any others who have any manner of way been Aiding, Aſſiſting, or Conſenting, though *tacitly*, to the Contravention of their *Princes* to any Part of this *Bull*, that is, as I ſaid before, almoſt every one above the Condition of a Ploughman, are hereby all *Damn'd*, by all the *Authority* the *Pope* has. Therefore have a Care of giving him too much, for he will take all any body will give. He accepted this from *Bellarmin*, that *if the Pope ſhould Command the Practice of Vice, and forbid Virtue, the Church were bound to believe Vice to be good, and Virtue to be wicked.* Nay his own *Canon Law* ſaith, That *if the Pope were ſo wicked, as to carry with him innumerable People by Troops as Slaves to Hell, to be with himſelf for ever Tormented; yet no Mortal Man whatever muſt preſume here to reprove his Faults, becauſe he is Judge of all, and himſelf to be judged of none.* So then they muſt keep their Reproofs, and not endeavour to ſtop the Career till they are with Him in *Hell*, for then I ſuppoſe his *Supremacy* ceaſes! Behold the *Machine*, of Humane

De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 5.

Decret. part 1. *diſt* 40. *can.* 6. *Si. Papa.*

mane Invention, which *God* never thought of, nor ever once mentioned, of Climbing to Heaven by a ſort of *Mechaniſm*, upon a Ladder of *Popes*, *Cardinals*, *Councils*, &c. And though we ſee them leading us by Troops into *Hell*, we muſt give no Obſtruction, becauſe it would break the *Machine* of their being our *Infallible Guides* to *Heaven!*

(23.) *L.* But after all, if you could find an *Infallible Guide*, whom you believed to be ſo, it would give you much Eaſe, and be a Comfort to you.

G. But I muſt have ſome *Reaſon* to believe him to be ſuch a *Guide*. And I could not be more ſure of it, than of the Truth of that Reaſon upon which I did believe it. So that all Recurs upon my own *Reaſon* ſtill. And if my *Reaſon* miſleads me in this, it is the moſt fatal Deluſion, becauſe it ſtops all Methods of Recovery, when I have once given to another the *Dominion* over my *Faith*. But this the *Apoſtles* diſclaimed, for when they Exhorted the *Churches*, they ſaid, *Not for that we have Dominion over your Faith, but are Helpers of your Joy: For by Faith ye ſtand*, that is, by your own *Faith*. And *if we, or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel unto you, let him be accurſed.* Did not this make them Judges, whether any New *Goſpel* or *Doctrine* was Preached unto them? And our *Saviour* bids them ſtick to their

2 Cor. I. 24.

Gal. I. 8.

their own Judgment, and said unto them, *Yea, and why even of your own selves judge ye not what is Right?* And, *if I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not.* Was not this Appealing to their Judgment, whether He did the Works of His Father, or not? And as many as followed their own Judgment they believed on Him: But they who were tyed up *Implicitly* to the *Authority* of the *Church*, they rejected Him, they said, *Have any of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on Him? But this People who knoweth not the Law are Cursed.*

Luke xii. 57.

John x. 37.

John vii. 48.

L. If a Man durst dispute the Methods of *Providence*, it would seem strange that God did not order it so, as that the *Church* should have first known their *Messiah* when He came, and have declared Him to the *People*, and then they all would have Believed on Him.

G. The *Apostle* says, *That the foolishness of God is wiser than Men.* And he gives the Reason in the Words following, why *God chose the foolish things of the World to confound the Wise, that no Flesh should Glory in his Presence, but he that Glorieth, let him Glory in the Lord.* And he applieth this to the Case we are upon, to the Revelation of *Jesus Christ* when he came. For if he had been Received upon the Declaration and Authority of the *Church*, We had Gloried in the *Church*, whose Authority,

1 Cor. i. 25.

ty would have been Prior and Superior to that of *Chriſt* himſelf, as being the Ground upon which we believed Him. But as the *Sun* cannot be ſeen but by his own Light, ſo *God* and *Chriſt* cannot otherwiſe be known; no Adventitious or Borrowed Light can ſhew the Original Light whence all leſſer Lights are deriv'd, which, like the *Moon* and *Stars*, Diſappear at the Preſence of the *Sun*. So the *Church* diſappeared at the Preſence of *Chriſt*, who was known by His own Light only, *We beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.* John i. 14. Here was no going to the *Church* to know which was He? Or if you had, ſhe would have miſled you. It would have been like going to the *Moon* to ask where the *Sun* was. The *Church* is the *Moon*, and the *Stars* are the particular Biſhops and Doctors, and other Eminent Men: But *Chriſt* is the *Sun* of Righteouſneſs, and He will not give His Glory to another.

L. But few believed *Chriſt* when He came, or in all His Life, for it is ſaid, that *He was to the Jews a Stumbling-Block, and to the Greeks fooliſhneſs.* 1 Cor. i. 23.

G. The Stumbling-block to the *Jews* was the Authority of their *Church* againſt Him, as I have ſhewed. And the *Greeks*, that is, the *Gentiles*, could not till after the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt* have any Notion of the Oeconomy of our Redemption by Him. Nor was He preached unto them till after the

Viſion

Vision of the *Sheet* to St. *Peter* Act. x. For the *Gospel* was to be preached to the *Jews* first, but when they Rejected it, leaning upon the *Infallibility* of their *Church*, then it was sent to the *Gentiles*. Who being free from that Stumbling-Block of the *Church*, received it readily, and now make up the whole Body of the *Christian Church* throughout the World.

Act. xiii. 46.

And this teaches us another thing, that is, That an *Infallible Guide* (supposing such a one) would not be an *Infallible* Assurance to us, unless we were *Infallible* too: For besides our not knowing Him, or mistaking another for Him, for there has been *False Christs*, We might Misunderstand his Doctrine, and turn it to quite contrary Purposes from what He intended. This was the Case in our *Saviour*'s Time. He was a Guide truly *Infallible*, and yet how few followed Him, notwithstanding all His *Miracles* and Heavenly *Doctrine*? Therefore while we are *Fallible* our selves, and lyable to Errors, and Mistakes, in vain do we Grope after an *Infallible* Assurance, otherwise than the *Evidence* of things makes them Plain to that Reason which God has given us.

The *Angels* of *Heaven* fell: *Adam* fell from his Innocency. And the Seven *Bishops* who were the Seven *Stars* in the Right Hand of *Christ*, and the Seven *Golden Candlesticks*, the Seven *Churches* in the midst of which He walked, these all are *Fallen*;

Rev. i. 20.

Fallen; and what are We that we expect *Infallibility*? What *Bishop*, what *Church* now is so *Infallibly* Seated as these beloved *Seven* were? What *Church* has a Promise of being Exempted from that General *Defection* which is foretold will be before the *Second Coming* of *Christ*, when He shall not find Faith upon the Earth? Or may we not rather think, that the Plea of *Infallibility* in the Church of *Rome* (so many ways Detected) which hides Repentance from her Eyes, and hinders her to Return from any of her Errors, which by this means continually Flow without any Ebbing on any Side, I say, May we not think this always Increasing Corruption the chief Cause to bring on that Universal *Defection* in the latter times?-Does it not seem to hasten apace, to be even at the Doors, when we see no *Absurdity* so Great, no *Text* of *Scripture* so Full and Express, to be too hard for this *Infallibility*? Not the Denying of all our outward *Senses* at once, and owning that we neither *See*, *Hear*, *Feel*, *Taste*, nor *Smell!* Not the express Institution of the *Lord's Supper* in *both Kinds*, to which the Council of *Constance* claps a *Non Obstante*, and takes away the *Cup* from the *Laity!* Not the Authority and Strong Reasoning of the *Apostles*, 1 Cor. xiv. against *Publick Prayer* in an *Unknown Tongue!* All these are Over-Ruled by *Infallibility!* And many more we have to Instance in the particular *Doctrines* in Dispute with the Church of *Rome*: In

all which, by Vertue of her *Unlimited* and *Infallible* Power of *Interpretation*, ſhe leaves no *Text* of *Scripture* of any Meaning, other than ſhe thinks fit to put upon them, let the Words be never ſo Expreſs. And this indeed is no other than taking the *Scriptures* wholly from us, while we muſt not Read them with our own Underſtanding. And the Reſult of this, is, That the whole *Foundation* of our *Faith* is in the *Church* of *Rome*, without *Scripture* or any thing elſe, becauſe the *Scripture* and every thing elſe is put *Abſolutely* and *Implicitly* in her Power. And yet no Man alive knows what this *Church* of *Rome* is, or where to be found? I mean that *Church* of *Rome* to which the *Infallibility* is annexed. For if you travel to *Rome*, you will ſee nothing there but what, by a Modern Diſtinction, you call the *Court* of *Rome*. Where then is this Infallible *Church* of *Rome*? Some place it in the *Pope* alone, as the only Heir of St. *Peter*, and *Living Judge* of Controverſy, and therefore above all *Councils*, and the whole *Body* of the *Church* put together: Others like not this, and becauſe ſome *Popes* have proved *Heretical*, and have been *Cenſured* and *Depoſed* for it; and others of them have proved moſt *Wicked* and *Flagitious* Men, who beſides the Viciouſneſs of their own *Lives*, have filled the World with *Blood*, *Rebellions*, and *Uſurpations*, in purſuance of the *Depoſing* Power they have aſſumed over *Princes*; for theſe and other Reaſons, they would

would not have the *Infallibility* truſted with the *Pope*, but lodge it in a *General Council*, as Superior to the *Pope*, with Power to *Reform* and even to *Depoſe* him : A *Third* Party approve of neither of theſe ways, for as they think the *Pope* alone without a *Council*, not to be *Infallible*, ſo neither the *Council* without the *Pope*, who is the *Head* of it, and without whom there cannot be a Lawful *Council*, as not a *Parliament* without the *King*, theſe are for *King* and *Parliament*, and place the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* in neither *Pope* nor *Council* apart, but only when both together and agreeing ; but becauſe this will Defeat ſeveral of thoſe *Councils* called *General*, and ſplit others, as when the *Pope* or his *Legats* withdrew from the *Council* (like a *King* leaving his Parliament) then ſuch was no longer a *Lawful Council*, but a *Schiſmatical Conventicle*, as was ſaid of the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, &c. and becauſe there have been *Popes* againſt *Popes*, and *Councils* againſt *Councils* ; and that the Requiſits neceſſary to Conſtitute a *Lawful Council* and conſequently *Infallible*, or ſome of them Diſputed, as the *Authority* of *Summoning* and *Convening* the *Council*, and *Preſiding* in it ; and other Requiſites allowed by all to be Neceſſary, are Impoſſible to be known with any Certainty, as, That all the *Fathers* there met ſhould uſe all Diligence to Examine and Canvaſs to the bottom every Point that comes before them ; and that

they ſhould be under no Terror or Fear of any, nor Byaſſed by Party, hopes of Preferment or Gain, or any other Corrupt Paſſion, but doing all things out of true Zeal to the Glory of *God*, and good of the *Church*; otherwiſe that there is no *Infallibility* follows that *Council*; and this being Impoſſible for any to know but *God* alone, conſequently the *Infallibility* of all *Councils* is rendered Precarious, and no Certainty at all in them; or rather it is Certain, by the Hiſtories of all *General Councils*, that theſe Humane Paſſions, not Conſiſtent with *Infallibility*, had an Influence in all or moſt of them; ſo that we cannot be Certain of the *Infallibility* of any *Council*, unleſs we are Infallibly Sure that none of theſe Humane Paſſions had a Mixture in it: This makes a *Fourth* Party in the *Church* of *Rome*, that is, of thoſe who place the *Infallibility* neither in *Pope* nor *Council*, Jointly or Severally, but in the *Church Militant*, as they ſpeak, that is, the Church *Diffuſive*, or all *Churches* up and down the World. We muſt then Travel and Learn. Here is a wide Mark, and we are plainly left at laſt to our own *private Judgment*, to Collect and Compare, to Approve or Reject what we find Scattered in all the Diſtant *Churches* upon Earth. And no Man's Life or Capacity will be Sufficient to make the Inquiry, in any tollerable Meaſure.

And now, My Lord, which of theſe *Four* Sorts of *Infallibility* will you take? There are

Three

Three to One againſt you, chooſe which you will. And all theſe are of the *Church* of *Rome*. And what Difference is ther betwixt having no Guide, or one you cannot find?

L. If I cannot find him, I have him not; and that is all one as to have None.

Miſerable Man! If he has no *Infallible Guide*, and is *Fallible* himſelf; and yet upon his going Right depends his Eternal either Happineſs or Miſery.

(24.) *G.* You may as well find fault with the *Creation*. *Shall the Clay ſay to the Potter, why haſt thou made me thus?* Who was Guide to the *Angels* that fell? Who was Guide to *Adam?* Who was, or who is, Guide to all the Earth? To the *Heathens*, to *Mahometans*, to *Jews?* Theſe laſt ſtick to their *Church*, as an *Infallible Guide*, and therefore are moſt Obſtinate, and the moſt Inveterate Enemies to *Chriſtianity*. Who is Guide to *Infants* and to *Idiots?* And ſhall we Interrogate the *Almighty* what he will do with theſe, or why He Created them? And perhaps the greateſt Part of Mankind Die before they come to the Years of Diſcretion: And when they are of Age, how few are Capable to Judge, or have Opportunity or Capacity to Examine the different Pleas betwixt *Church* and *Church*, *Religion* and *Religion*? And do we not ſee the Generality of the World take up their *Church* and *Religion* juſt according to their

Education? My Lord, if you and I had been Born and Bred in *Turky*, We might have been *Mahometans.*

L. Is *Religion* then nothing but a *Chance*, according to the Place we are Born in or where we receive our *Education* ?

G. No, My Lord, *Truth* is *Truth*, though all the World ſhould depart from it. And ther have been Converts in all Nations and Religions. But none where Men cannot be perſuaded to overcome the Prejudice of Education, and Examine Impartially for themſelves. But *Infallibility* barrs all Examination, for that Implies a Doubt, and brings us to *private Judgment*, and where then ſhall we Wander ? And yet you muſt apply to every Man's *private Judgment* when you would make him a Convert to your *Church*, why elſe do you Argue or Reaſon with him ? Muſt he not then Examine all the Arguments and Motives you give him for the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, and Judge for himſelf whether they are well Grounded, and will bear the Teſt of *Reaſon ?* Or muſt every body have *Reaſon* and *Examine* but your ſelves ? Believe it then you are in the moſt Dangerous Condition of any. And you are the Men who receive your *Religion* by *Chance*, juſt according to your *Education*. Suppoſe another ſhould Return your own Anſwer to you, and ſay, I will not *Examine*, I am *Infallibly* Sure, and I will hear no more : What would you think of ſuch a Man? Every *Enthuſiaſt* will tell

tell you the ſame. He will take his *Oath* that he is *Infallible!* And will hear no more than the *deaf Adder* the *Charms* of *Reaſon*; but he will bid you Silence your *Reaſon*, for that is it which blinds you, though *Solomon* calls it the *Lamp of God*, which He hath planted in our Heart, *Prov.* xx. 27. This is the *Image of God* in which He created us, and will be our Judge and Witneſs in the laſt Day, as it is given us for our Guide here. But inſtead of Trimming this *Lamp*, to make it burn clearly, we hear the General Cry from your Side, *Put it out*——*Put it out*——We cannot deal with you 'till that *Lamp* be Extinguiſhed, it Thwarts us every Turn, and Starts a hundred Objections, that we cannot Believe peaceably for it. But when it is quite taken away (if that were poſſible to be done) then you offer to ſhew us a *Meteor* of *Infallibility* (about which your ſelves are not Agreed, nor know where to find it) which will keep us from ever *Doubting* any more. As when a Man's *Eyes* are put out, he cannot ſee a *Dirty Step* or a *Precipice* before him, and then he is in that State of *Security* you propoſe.

L. You ſee how this Guide of yours, this *Lamp* of *Reaſon* has mis-led the Nations; for *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, &c. all plead *Reaſon*.

G. And we have no other Method with them than to *Reaſon* on ſtill with them, and Shew them that *Reaſon* is of our Side. And vaſt Multitudes of them have been thus Converted, even all the *Chriſtian Churches* now in

the World; for all of them are of the *Gentiles*. And for those who yet remain Unconverted, or have not had the *Gospel* sufficiently proposed to them, we must leave them to *God* Who made them, and will Require from no Man more than He has given him, but will Judge all People Righteously. Of this I have spoke before.

(25.) But I observe that since this Notion of *Infallibility* came in to the *Church* of *Rome*, it has Rooted out all *Charity*, and her *Religion* has been chiefly Employed in *Cursing* and *Damning* all the World but her self. Her *Canons* are tagged with *Anathemaes* upon every Occasion, and you hear little in them of who shall be *Saved*, but every Page is full of who must be *Damned*. And the *Bulla in Cœna* pins the Basket, and leaves very few to Escape, even of the *Roman Communion* it self.

It is a Common Argument with which your *Priests* frighten *Women* and *Children*, viz. *You* Protestants *say it is possible for a* Papist *to be saved: But we* Papists *say, it is impossible for a* Protestant *to be Saved: Therefore it is safer being of our Side.* But this has turned to their Confusion, for as ther is nothing in it but a confident *Averring*, it shews that they have no *Charity*, which is Greater even than *Faith* it self, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 13. And therefore that they can be no *Christian Church:* Their Want of *Charity* being by this much plainer than our Want of *Faith*. Take *Chillingworth's* Answer to this, *Chap.* vii.

of

of his Works, *p.* 306. " You (*says he to* Knot *the* Jesuit) " vainly pretend, *that all Roman* " *Catholicks, not one excepted, profess that Pro-* " *testancy unrepented destroys Salvation.* From " which Generality we may except Two at least " to my Knowledge, and these are, Your self, " and *Franciscus de Sancta Clara*, who assures us, " that Ignorance and Repentance may excuse " a *Protestant* from Damnation, tho' Dying in " his Error. And this is all the Charity, which " by your own Confession also, the most fa- " vourable *Protestants* allow to *Papists.*

Militiere was persuaded that King *Charles* I. was Happy in Heaven, because he preferred the *Catholick* Faith before his Crown, his Liberty, his Life. [Now it is known to all the World that King *Charles* I. lived and dyed in the Communion of the *Church* of *England*, which he declared with his last Breath upon the Scaffold.] But Arch-Bishop *Bramhal* gave him this Answer, " That which you have con- " fessed here concerning King *Charles*, will spoil " your former Demonstration, *That the Prote-* " *stants have neither Church nor Faith.* But you " confess no more here than I have heard some " of your famous *Roman* Doctors at *Paris* ac- " knowledge to be true in General; and no more than that which the Bishop of *Chalcedon* (a Man that cannot be suspected of Partiality on our " Side) hath Affirmed and Published in Two of " his Books to the World in Print. That *Pro-* " *testantibus credentibus*, &c. *Persons living in* " *the Communion of the Protestant Church, if*

" *they*

" *they endeavour to learn the Faith, and are not* " *able to attain unto it; but hold it implicitly in* " *the Preparation of their Minds, and are ready* " *to Receive it when God ſhall be pleaſed to Re-* " *veal it* (which all good *Proteſtants* and all " good *Chriſtians* are) *they neither want Church,* " *nor Faith, nor Salvation.*

L. Militiere ſuppoſed that King *Charles* I. Secretly and Inviſibly in the Laſt Moments of his Life, was by God's Spirit United to the *Roman Catholick* Church.

G. Then no *Proteſtant*, at leaſt no *Proteſtant King* need Deſpair——But to theſe Divines let us add ſome Royal Teſtimonies. King *James* I. in his *Præmonition to Chriſtian Monarchs* tell us, That his Mother (Queen *Mary*) as ſhe was ready to lay her Head upon the Block, ſent him this Meſſage; *That although ſhe was of another Religion than that wherein he was brought up, yet ſhe would not preſs him to change, except his Conſcience forc'd him to it, not doubting but if he led a good Life, and were careful to do Juſtice and Govern well, he would be in a Good Caſe in his own Religion.*

This was perfectly agreeable to the Sentiments of his Grandſon the late King *Jam.* II. who often ſpoke to thoſe Divines who had the Inſtruction of both his Daughters, to be Diligent in making them Religious and Good *Chriſtians*, in the Way of the Church of *England*, without ſo much as hinting at any Change of their Principles towards the Church of *Rome*, as I have heard my ſelf from Two of

of them, Dr. *Turner* late Lord Biſhop of *Ely*, and Dr. *Ken* late Lord Biſhop of *Bath* and *Wells*. And neither before nor after his coming to the Crown would he ſuffer any Attempt to be made upon them as to *Religion*, of which there is an eminent Witneſs now alive, who knows if I ſpeak Truth. And when a certain Zealot preſſed him to endeavour their Reconciliation to the Church of *Rome*, and offered his Service for the purpoſe, the *King* anſwered, *No, let them alone, they are ſo Good they will be Saved in any Church.*

L. It is ſtrange then he ſhould be a *Roman Catholick* himſelf.

G. Not at all, for he might think that beſt for him, without thinking thoſe in hazard who were ſincerely of the *Church* of *England*, and lived up to the Rules of it.

L. He could not think it lawful to be preſent at your *Common Prayers*.

G. He did not think it Unlawful, becauſe he heard them at his *Coronation*.

L. That was upon a particular Occaſion. But does any *Roman Catholick* think it Lawful to hear them Conſtantly or Frequently?

(26.) *G.* They did think ſo, for after the *Reformation* the *Roman Catholicks* of *England* came to our *Churches* and to our *Common Prayer* without any Scruple. And this continued till about the Tenth Year of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, when Pope *Pius* V. forbad it by his *Bull*. So that he made the *Separation*, and if he had not ſufficient *Power* to do it, or that ther

ther was not sufficient *Cause* for it, then he made the *Schism* too, and it lies wholly at his Door. Now it is the undoubted Right of every *National Church* to Reform, Alter, and Model their *Liturgy* as shall be most Convenient, provided there be nothing put into it that is contrary to the *Faith*, which is not so much as Alledged against our *Publick Offices*. They have a *Breviary* at *Milan* and in other Places, different from that at *Rome*. And in *England* before the *Reformation* ther were Divers in several Dioceses, as what was used in the Church of *Salisbury*, of *Hereford*, of *Bangor*, of *York*, of *Lincoln*, &c. as is mentioned in the *Preface* to our *Common-Prayer Book*, *concerning the Service of the Church*. But these Differences did not break *Communion*, nor did the Alteration made at the *Reformation*, till the *Pope* by the Plenitude of his *Supremacy*, and to be Revenged upon Queen *Elizabeth*, took upon him to break the *Communion*. For which as ther was no Sufficient *Cause*, our *Liturgy* being all *Orthodox*, even our Enemies being Judges; so on the other hand, the *Pope*'s *Supremacy* did not extend to break in upon the Rights and Liberties of any *National Church*, as has been and is still Maintained by the whole *Gallican* Church, and others the most Learned in the Church of *Rome*. And my Lord, I know some *Roman Catholicks* of Figure and good Sense in *England*, who meerly upon this Account have come over to our Church, and thought themselves Obliged to Return to the

Communion

Communion of their *National Church*, and to heal the Breach made by that Exceſs of the *Pope's Supremacy*, which no ſober Man on this Side the *Alps* will own. It is ſtrange to Own it in *Fact*, and yet deny it in *Words*. Whoever own this *Bull* of *Pius* V. for breaking *Communion* in *England*, muſt alſo own the full Extent of the *Bulla in Cœna*, which has his Authority, in a particular Manner, as well as of all the *Popes* ſince. And it Damns almoſt all the *Papiſts*, as well as all who are not *Papiſts*.

(27.) *L.* We deſire not to be called *Papiſts*, we think it a Word of Contempt, as if we were only Partiſans for the *Pope*, and of that Party or Faction of *Chriſtians* who would Raiſe his Power above the *Church* and every thing elſe.

G. I am glad Your Lordſhip thinks ſo, and indeed the Church of *France* (where you were Bred) are not *Papiſts* in this Senſe. They are got free, in a good Meaſure from the Servitude of the *Pope*. But they are ſtill *Roman Catholicks*.

L. We do not delight in that Word neither, as if our *Catholiciſm* were tyed only to *Rome*; we term our ſelves *Catholicks* in General, as Members of the *Catholick* or *Univerſal* Church.

G. We call our ſelves ſo too, and in the ſame Senſe, and Pray every Day for the *Catholick Church* in our Liturgy. Therefore we call not you *Catholicks*, becauſe it would not Diſtinguiſh

guiſh *you* from *us*. But *Roman Catholicks* is calling a Part the Whole.

L. You know the Meaning, not that the Particular *Church* of *Rome* is all the *Churches* in the World, but ſhe is called *Catholick*, as being the *Head* and *Principle of Unity* and *Communion* to all other *Churches*.

G. If this be the Frame of the *Catholick Church*, it muſt have been ſo always.

L. Yes ſurely, for ther was always a *Catholick Church*, that is, ſome particular Church, ſo called, in the ſame Senſe as *Rome* is now.

G. Pray then, My Lord, tell me what Particular *Church* was ſo called, in this Senſe, before there was a *Chriſtian* in *Rome*? And how came that *Church* to loſe it? And how was it transferred to *Rome?*

Every *Biſhop*, every *Church*, and every *Member* of it, may be called *Catholick*, and were ſo called, as being included in the General Notion of the *Catholick Church*; but in the Senſe you have Mentioned, as *Head* and *Principle of Unity* to all *Churches*, no *Biſhop* or *Church* ever had it, till taken up in the latter times by the Biſhop and *Church* of *Rome*.

(28.) *L.* But how came the *Biſhop* of *Rome* to that great Sway he has long obtained in the *Church?*

G. It is very Obvious, becauſe *Rome* was the *Metropolis* of the *Empire:* And conſequently her *Biſhop* muſt be more Conſpicuous than any other, have more Reſpect pay'd him, and more

Applications

Applications made to him, especially after the *Emperors* became *Christian.* And for the same Reason, when the *Seat* of the *Empire* was translated to *Constantinople*, the *Bishop* of that *Church* took upon him, and Aspired further to an *Universal Supremacy*, but was Opposed by *Gregory* the Great, Bishop of *Rome.* Ther was no other Consideration then for the Superiority of one Bishop or Church, but the Secular Dignity of the Place; for which Reason the *Patriarch* of *Jerusalem* (which was Unconteſtably the Mother Church of all) was postponed, and made the Lowest of all the *Patriarchs.* But for *Divine Right*, and *Christ* having Named any one *Bishop* or *Church* as *Head* and *Superior* to all others, there is not a Word. And it could not be *Rome* before *Rome* was *Christian*; and *Christ* never Named her upon any Occasion whatsoever, or gave the least Hint towards her, or that possibly can be applyed to her. Strange and Unaccountable! If he meant to Build the whole *Christian Faith* upon her, and to make her the *Catholick Church*, as Including all other *Churches* of *Christians*, and in all Ages throughout the whole World!

But, My Lord, *Fact* (as I said before) is the sureſt way to give us a true Light of Things. And the *Frame* or *Government* of the *Church* is a *Fact*, which must be Determined by *Histories* and *Records*, not Criticising upon *Words* that afford no *Certainty.* Let us look therefore into the *Frame* of the *Church* from the Beginning.

Beginning. I hope I have made it Plain from the *Hiſtory* of the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, that ther was none of them Appointed as *Sovereign* over the others, whatever *Words* may be ſtrained in favour of St. *Peter*; for if he was called a *Rock* or *Foundation*, ſo were all the others; they are called the *Thelve Foundations* of the *Church*. Which is ſaid to be *Built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles, and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt Himſelf being the chief Corner Stone.* And not any particular *Prophet* or *Apoſtle*. And if the *Keys* of *Heaven* were promiſed to *Peter*, this was fulfilled in giving them to him Jointly with all the others, without any Mark of Superiority in him. As in the Commiſſion to *Teach all Nations*, it was Equal to them all. And we find in *Fact* that it was Exerciſed by them all with equal Authority.

Rev. xxi. 14.

Eph. ii. 20.

Matth. xvi. 19.

Joh. xx. 23.

Matth. xxviii. 19.

And all the Regimen of the *Church* which the *Apoſtles* appointed was that of *Biſhops* in their ſeveral *Diſtricts*, without any *Head* or *Sovereign Biſhop* over them all, as Supreme *Judge* of *Controverſy*: Of which ther is not the leaſt Title to be found in any of the Hiſtories or Writings of thoſe Ages next after the *Apoſtles*; though ther were many *Controverſies* even in *Faith* among them, which an Appeal to this *Judge* had ſpeedily ended;

ended; but no such thing appears, which could not have been missed had it been known. *Metropolitans* were Early, that is, the *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* or Chief *City* of a *Province*, who did Preside in the *Synods* of that *Province*, and had other *Ecclesiastical* Privileges granted him, by the Common Consent of the *Bishops* of the *Province*, for *Order* Sake, and greater Harmony of *Discipline*. But a *Patriarch* with Jurisdiction over several *Metropolitans* or *Provinces* was never heard of in the *Church* till the Council of *Chalcedon*, 450 Years after *Christ*. And many *Provinces* were not put under these *Patriarchs*, but had Exempt Jurisdiction of their own as before, of which *Britain* was one; for the *Patriarchat* of *Rome* extended only to *Italy* and the Isles adjacent. But the first Pretence to *Universal Supremacy* was set up by *John*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, after the Seat of the *Empire* was translated thither, against whom *Gregory* the Great wrote, and said that though his *See* of *Rome* had always the Precedence of *Constantinople*, yet that none of his Predecessors, the Bishops of *Rome*, had ever assumed such an Arrogant *Title*, which he calls a *Luciferian* Pride, and declares him who should take it to be the Fore-runner of *Anti-Christ*. And yet his Next Successor but One, that is *Boniface* III. did take it, being given him by *Phocas*, that Traitor and Usurper, who Murdered his Master *Mauricius*, the Emperor, and Seized his

Epist. Lib. ii. Ep. 32. 36. 38 Lib. vii. Ep. 30. 36, *&c.*

Throne, whom *Boniface* Owned and Abetted, and was made *Universal Bishop* for his Reward, in the Beginning of the *Seventh* Century. Thus the *Supremacy* now Claimed by *Rome* was Introduced, and has been Maintained *pro Viribus* ever since. And under this *Britain* has been subdued, which never was under the *Patriarchat* of *Rome:* So much has the *Government* and *Unity* of the *Church* been Altered from what it was in the *Apostles* time, or in the First Ages of the *Church.* And thus has *Rome* Usurped the Name of the *Catholick Church*, and placed all its *Unity* in Submission to her *Bishop!* Here we see the Degrees by which this Encroachment crept on; the *Patriarchat* began in the *Fifth*, and the *Universal Supremacy* in the *Seventh Century.* And *Britain* which held it out against the *Patriarchat* of *Rome*, was at last Conquered by the more Apparent *Usurpation* of her *Universal Supremacy*, so Obtained as I have told.

And yet I have heard some *Britains* say, That though they thought the *Church* of *Rome* the most *Corrupt* Part of the *Christian Church*, both as to *Doctrine* and *Worship*, and to be a *Cage* full of *Unclean Birds*; yet that they must be of her, and enter into that *Cage*, because she was the *Catholick Church.* This is like that Desperate Maxim in the *Canon Law*, I quoted before out of the *Decretals*, That *though the Pope should draw Infinite Numbers of People with him into Hell, yet we must not find Fault with him, nor Reprove him*, &c.

(29.) And

(29.) And I must observe also here, That though *France* has thrown off the Pope's *Infallibility*, and his *Deposing* Power over *Princes*, and has Limited his *Supremacy*, that is indeed taken it wholly away, for no *Supremacy* (properly so called) can be Limited, for then it Ceases to be *Supreme:* Yet *France* remains still in the Dreggs of the Corruptions of *Rome*, both as to *Doctrine* and *Worship*. The Religion of the People there, is, the Adoration of the *Host*, and of the *Cross*, Invocation of *Saints*, Worship of *Images*, praying Souls out of *Purgatory*, telling their *Beads*, and going to *Confession*.

(30.) *L.* I have heard your self say, that *Confession* was a good Thing, rightly Used.

G. And so I say still, But not in that Sense it is generally used with you, and is Expressed in your *Catechism ad Parochos*, *de Pœnitentiæ Sacramento*, Sect. 46, 47. That such a Repentance as God will not Accept, nor Pardon for it, is made sufficient by the *Sacrament of Penance*, and all our Sins Remitted by it. And that *Pauciſſimi*, very *few* can be saved without it. They might have said, *None*, for they here require in Repentance acceptible to God, a Sense and Sorrow for Sin that shall be fully Equal to the Demerit, *Ut cum scelerum Magnitudine Æquari conferrique possit*, which is Impossible for Mortal Man. And therefore All must be Damned without this *Sacrament of Penance*. And they

ſay; It was Neceſſary that God ſhould Inſtitute this Sacrament, as an Eaſier way for Men to get to Heaven. *Quare neceſſe fuit ut clementiſſimus Dominus faciliori ratione communi hominum ſaluti conſuleret.* An Eaſy way indeed! *Confeſs* to a *Prieſt* and get *Abſolution*, and this makes up the *Defects* of your *Repentance*, and you are ſaved *ex Opere Operato*, by the *Work wrought* the *bare Performance* of this *Sacrament*. And the Council of *Trent* Anathematizes all thoſe who ſay that the very *Sacraments* of the Goſpel do not confer *Grace* in the ſame Manner, by the bare Performance. *Si quis dixerit per ipſa Novæ legis Sacramenta ex Opere Operato non conferri Gratiam——Anathema ſit.* Seſſ. 7. Can. 8. It is true that God did Inſtitute His *Sacraments* as *Means* of *Grace*, (for which we Bleſs His Name Daily in our *General Thankſgiving*) but this turns them into *Charms*, when the very *Sacraments* themſelves, *ipſa Sacramenta*, confer the *Grace*, *ex Opere Operato*, by the bare Performance of the *Work*.

Let us Exemplify this to our ſelves by the like Uſe made of the *Inſtitutions* of *God* under the *Law*. The *Jews* had got this Notion of the *Opus Operatum*, that the bare Performance of the *Letter* of the *Law*, in their *Sacrifices*, *Feaſts*, *Faſts*, and other *Obſervances* was all that was Required of them. Whence the Voices of all the *Prophets* were againſt theſe *Inſtitutions*, they call them *Iniquity*, *Abomination*, and

and *Hateful* to *God:* Nay, God denies that He did *Require* them, or ever did *Institute* them. That is, as a dead Carcass without a Soul, and Working like *Charms* by the bare *Opus Operatum.* God did never Institute such, nor does Require them at our Hands. And may we not say, no more under the *Gospel* than the *Law?* For the *Gospel* introduced a more Pure and Spiritual Worship, but the Council of *Trent* by Naming only the Sacraments of the *New Law*, applies the *Opus Operatum* to them also, if not Chiefly.

Isa. i. 11, 12, 13. 14. Jer. vii. 22.

What else is the Meaning of tying Men to the Repetition of such a percise Number of *Ave's* and *Pater's* and *Credo's*, at such particular Times, whether the Mind goes along with them, or not? For you will see People in the Markets, buying and selling, or Discoursing of Common Business, and droping their *Beads* all the while, to keep Count if they have Rightly Performed their Task of the *Opus Operatum.*

But if *Prayers* and *Sacraments*, which are *Means* of *Grace* of *God's* own *Institution*, may be thus Abused, and rendred Hateful to *God:* What shall we say of those *Means* of *Grace* which are of *Man's* mere *Invention?* None can Appoint the *Means* but he who has the bestowing of the *End* to be Obtained by those *Means:* As if I have a Thousand Pounds to Bestow, I may put what Conditions I

think fit, and Appoint the *Means* for the Obtaining it; and none else can Appoint the *Means*: Now *Grace* is the Gift of the *Holy Ghost*, and none can Appoint the *Means* of Obtaining it, but who has the Bestowing of the *Holy Ghost*; which it is the Highest *Blasphemy* for any *Creature* to Assume to Himself; hence *Christ*'s sending the *Holy Ghost* is a sure Proof of His *Divinity*: But the Church of *Rome* takes upon her to Appoint *Means* of *Grace*, many and various; the whole *Pontifical* is made up of the *Forms* of *Consecration* of every thing almost one can think of into *Means* of *Grace*, as *Bells*, *Books*, *Candles*, *Water*, *Salt*, *Oil*, *Ashes*, *Palms*, *Swords*, *Banners*, and *Vestments* of divers Sorts, even to *Childrens Clouts*, besides *Crosses*, *Pictures*, *Images*, *Agnus Dei's*, &c. By the Use of which, in the Manner prescribed, several *Graces*, both Ghostly and Bodily, are said to be Obtained, as besides the Favour of God, and the Remission of Sins, the Saving from *Fire*, from *Diseases*, from *Storms* at *Sea*, *Thunder*, *Lightning*, and *Tempest* at *Land*, at which times they Ring their Consecrated *Bells*, to Allay the *Winds*, and Chase away the *Dæmons* of the *Air*, who seeing the *Sign* of the *Cross* upon such *Bells*, and hearing their Sound, shall be *Frighted* and *Fly away*, as it is Expressed in the *Form* of *Consecration* of *Bells* in the *Pontifical*. Nay ther is Nothing in the World so Insignificant, a *Rose*, or a *Feather*, which the *Pope* may not *Consecrate* into a *Means* of

Grace

Grace, and is in Use every Day. And at *Rome* they are counted *Atheists* who have not Faith in these things. So much they Place their *Religion* in them!

L. The *Dissenters* Object all this to you, as to your *Rites*, *Ceremonies*, *Habits*, &c.

G. But without any Ground, for we *Consecrate* none of these things, nor do we attribute any *Vertue*, Ghostly or Bodily to the use of them, as to the Wearing a *Surplice*, hearing a *Bell* or an *Organ*, &c. they are purely for *Decency* and *Order*, and we may Change them, or take them quite away every Day, as our Governours think fit. Can they shew any outward *Action* or *Thing* appointed in our *Church*, by the use of which *Evil Spirits* may be Chased away, *Women* helped in *Labour*, or *Storms* at *Sea* quell'd; All which and many more Vertues are attributed in your *Church* to the use of what you call *Holy Water*, and many other such like Institutions of Mechanical *Means* of *Grace*.

(31.) But that which makes up the Bulk of the *Romish Devotions* is, the *Worship* and *Invocation* of *Saints* and *Angels*, the Adoration of their *Images*, and of the *Reliques* of *Saints* departed, Pieces of their *Bodies* or of their *Vestments*, &c. to which great *Miracles* are attributed, and therefore they are made, strictly and properly, *Means* of *Grace*.

L. We desire the *Prayers* of one another upon *Earth*, why not much rather of the *Saints* and *Angels* in *Heaven.*

G. Because the one is *Commanded*, the other not, nay *Forbidden*, as I will shew you.

L. It seems to be giving greater Glory to *God*, and more *Humility* in us, not to Approach His Presence directly and immediately our selves, as we do not to an Earthly *King*, but by the Introduction and Recommendation of some eminent *Courtier* whom we know to be in His Favour.

G. Your Simile will Halt on all Four, for *God* is nearer to us than any *Saint* or *Angel*; *in God we Live and Move and have our Being*; but the *Angels* and *Saints* departed are at distance from us, and we know not where to find them, or that they hear our Prayers, for they are not every where, That is an Attribute of *God* alone.

L. Therefore our *School-men* say, they see our Prayers *in Speculo Trinitatis*, in the *Looking Glass* of *God.*

G. Do they see every thing in that *Looking-Glass?* Then they know as much as *God!* But if not, then how do we know they see our *Prayers* there? And how will this sort with your Simile of an Earthly *King*, that the *Courtier* must go to the *King* to know what I desired the *Courtier* to Ask of Him.

Abraham

Abraham is *the Father of us all. And he was called the Friend of God.* Therefore it is likely that he saw as far into that *Looking-Glass* as another. Yet it is said, *Isa.* lxiii. 16. *That Abraham is ignorant of us.* And are not we as Ignorant of their State, and what Knowledge they have of us below? We are told that they have no knowledge of it. *His Sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.*

Rom. iv. 16. Jām. ii. 23. Job xiv. 21.

L. It is said, that the *Angels* of *Heaven* rejoice over a *Sinner* that *Repenteth.*

G. That is when it pleaseth *God* to let them know it, or that the *Sinner* comes thither. But that they know of every *Penitent* upon *Earth*, is no where said, nor do I know it Asserted by any.

But instead of the School-Mens *Looking-Glass* and their vain *Philosophy*, if we would look into the plain Directions of Holy *Scripture*, we should settle our selves upon a much surer Foundation. See then what the *Apostle* says upon the very Case in hand, *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in a voluntary Humility* (or being a *voluntary* in *Humility*, as our *Margin* reads it) *and Worshipping of Angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puff'd up by his fleshly Mind; and not holding the Head, from which all the Body by Joints and Bands having Nourishment Ministred, and knit together*

Col. ii. 18, 19.

together, increaſeth with the increaſe of God. And after ſays, *ver.* 23. *Which things have indeed a ſhew of Wiſdom in Will-Worſhip and Humility*——Here is a full Anſwer to all your Pretenſions for this *Will-Worſhip* of *Saints* and *Angels*, for both go upon the ſame Foot. It is called, *Intruding into things we have not ſeen*, of which we are altogether Uncertain, and therefore Sinful in the Practice, by the Apoſtles Rule, *Rom.* xiv. 23. That *whatſoever is not of Faith, is Sin.* This was ſpoke in reſpect of *Meats*, but is much more ſo as to our *Worſhip* and Solemn *Devotions* to GOD——Your Compariſon of Acceſs to an Earthly *King*, is here called a *Fleſhly* or *Carnal* Thought, meaſuring *God* after the Manner of *Men*——And the Reſult of this is no leſs than *loſing our Reward*, that is, *Heaven*; for it is forſaking the *Head*, which is *Chriſt*, whoſe *Members* we are, and receive *Nouriſhment* from Him; not ſo from *Saints* or *Angels*; God has given *Chriſt* to Us as the *One Mediator between God and Men*, 1 Tim. ii. 5. But we have made to our ſelves many *Mediators* to Aſſiſt and Help *Him*, as if his Mediation and Interceſſion were not Sufficient. And we make more Applications to Them than to Him, or to *God* himſelf. You have Ten *Ave Maria's* for One *Pater Noſter.*

And you have Multiplyed theſe *Saints* to your ſelves without Number, like the Heathen *Deities*, and New *Canonizations* are going on every Day. Every *Country*, *City*, *Pariſh*, and almoſt

almoſt *Perſon* have a particular *Saint* for their *Patron.* You have *Saints*, as they had *Gods*, for the *Sea*, for the *Air*, *Fire*, &c. for *Peace*, for *War*, for *Learning*, and all ſorts of *Trades* and *Occupations.* St. *Chriſtopher* and St. *Clement* are for the *Sea*, eſpecially the Virgin *Mary* to whom the Sea Men Sing *Ave Maris Stella.* St. *Agatha* is for the *Fire*, and they make *Letters* on her Day to quench *Fire* with. St. *Nicholas* and St. *Gregory* are for *Scholars*, St. *Luke* for *Painters*, &c. And they have *Saints* for all *Diſeaſes*, St. *Cornelis* cures the *Falling-Sickneſs*, St. *Roche* the *Pox*, St. *Apollonia* the *Tooth-Ach*, &c. And they have particular *Saints* for all *Beaſts* and *Cattle*, St. *Loy* preſides over the *Horſes*, and St. *Anthony* over the *Swine*, &c. And they bring their *Cattle* to be Bleſſed by theſe *Saints* on their particular Days. And they Pray to theſe *Saints* jointly with *God*, a *Scholar* ſays, *God* and St. *Nicholas* be my Speed. And when one *Sneezes*, *God* help and St. *John.* And to a *Horſe* if he Stumbles, *God* and St. *Loy* ſave thee, *&c.* And upon every Surprize they cry, *Jeſu Maria.*

(32.) *L.* You ſhould not compare theſe to the *Dæmons* of the *Heathens*, for they were *Evil Spirits.* And they called them *Gods.*

G. The Word *Gods* is frequently given in *Scripture* to *Angels* and to *Men* as *Miniſters* of *God.* And thus the *Heathens* underſtood it, and ſuppoſed their *Gods* to be ſuch *Miniſters*,

Miniſters, as *Æolus* to Govern the *Winds*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. Therefore they called them *Dii Medioxumi*, Inferior Gods, as ſtanding in the Middle betwixt the Supreme God and us, to Succor or Puniſh us, according to His Orders. St. *Auguſtine*, who knew them well, tells us what they Argued for themſelves, they ſaid, *We do not Worſhip Evil Dæmons or Spirits, but we worſhip thoſe whom you* (Chriſtians) *call Angels, the Powers of the Great God, the Myſteries of the Great God.* But St. *Auguſtine* anſwered them, That they muſt be *Evil Spirits* whom they Worſhipped, becauſe they Required *Worſhip* from *Men*, as the *Devil* did from our *Saviour*, which the Good *Angels* always Refuſed, and he quotes, *Rev.* xix. 10. xxii. 9. Where the *Angel* forbade *John* to Worſhip him. And the ſame did the *Saints* upon Earth, as *Peter* refuſed it from *Cornelius* and *Paul* and *Barnabas* from the Men of *Lyſtra*, &c.

Non colimus mala Dæmonia, Angelos quos dicitis, ipſos & Nos colimus Virtutes Dei Magni, & Myſteria Dei Magni. Auguſt in Pſal. xcvi.

Act. x. 26. xiv. 14, 15.

L. But we ſuppoſe not that the *Heathens* had any Notion of the *Supreme* and *True God*, but that they Worſhipped every one of their *Gods* as *Supreme* and *Independent*.

G. Some Men make *Monſters* of others, to hide their own *Deformity!* Your *Guides* have ſet up this Notion, to hinder the Parallel betwixt the *Heathen Worſhip* of their *Inferior Gods*, and yours of *Saints* and *Angels*. For ther

ther is nothing more Evident than that the *Heathen* did acknowledge the *One Supreme* and *True God*, though in much Ignorance and Superstition. St. *Paul* said that they *knew God*, that He was *Manifest* unto them, *even His Eternal Power and Godhead. So that they were without Excuse in their foolish Imagination, to change the Glory of the Uncorruptible God into an Image made like to Corruptible Man*, &c. And he told the *Athenians*, *Whom therefore ye ignorantly Worship, Him declare I unto you.* He did not preach a *false God* unto them, but they had blended the Worship of *God* with these Inferior *Gods* or *Dæmons*, which was their *Superstition*, for so the Word signifies Δεισιδαιμονία, the fear of these *Dæmons*, and it is thus rendred every where in the *New Testament*, which we translate *Superstition*, and so your own *Vulgar Latin*, Act. xvii. 22. and xxv. 19. And the *Latin* word *Superstitio* means the same thing, and is derived, as *Servius* has it from *Super Stare*, as being a fear of those Heavenly Powers who *Supra stant* stand over us, and so *Superstition* is *Superstantium rerum timor.* Others derive it from *Superstites*, that these *Devi ex hominibus facti*, Men Deifyed after their Death, are still *Superstites*, and the fear of them as such is *Superstition*; or *qui Superstitem Memoriam defunctorum Colunt*, Who Worship the Memory of these Dead Men.

Rom. i. 19, 20, 21, 22. 23.

Act. xvii. 23.

The

The Worſhip of theſe *leſſer Gods* is what is forbidden in the *Firſt Commandment*, which reſpects the *Object* of *Worſhip*, that no *Religious* Worſhip is to be given to any but to the *Supreme God* alone. The *Second* Commandment relates to the *Manner* of Worſhip, that is, by *Images*. But this your Church has hid from the People, and divided the *Tenth* into *Two* to keep up the Number, that the People might think they ſtill have the *Ten* Commandments. And it is thus in your very *Catechiſm ad Parochos*. But of this hereafter.

The *Heathens* had their Good and Evil *Dæmones*, as their Good and Evil *Genii*, but according to St. *Auguſtine*'s Rule, they muſt be *Evil Dæmons* who accepted the *Worſhip* of *Men*, which were all the Heathen *Dæmons*, therefore the Word *Dæmon* is taken in the Worſt Senſe, and tranſlated *Devil* throughout the *New Teſtament*, and what we tranſlate *the Doctrines of Devils*, 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. is the Doctrine of the *Dæmones*, or of the Worſhip of *Dæmones*, διδασκαλίαι Δαιμονίων, and a various Lection has it νεκρῶν λατρεύοντες, *who worſhip the Dead*. The *Dæmones* of the Heathen were their Dead *Heroes*, whom they made *Divi* by an *Apotheoſis*; as the *Pope* does *Saints* by a *Canonization*. But it is too Groſs to put it upon the *Heathen*, that they thought every one of thoſe *Gods* whom they Made was the *Supreme God* who made themſelves. They owned theſe to be *Leſſer Gods*, ond only the *Vertues* and *Powers* of the Great *God*; and they thought that they

they Honoured the *Supreme God* the more, by doing Honour to His Substitutes; and all their *Worship* was Ultimately Referred to Him. So that *He only was Worshipped in all their Gods and Goddesses; for they made him King of all their Gods and Goddesses.*

Hi omnes Dii Deæque sit Unus Jupiter. Augustin. de Civit. Dei l. iv. c. xi.

Ipsum enim Deorum omnium Dearumque Regem esse volunt. Ib. c. ix.

And the Common Appellation given to *Jupiter* in *Homer* is, Πατὴρ and Βασιλεὺς ἀνδρῶν τὲ Θεῶν τὲ, *The Father and King of the Gods as well as of Men.* And he represents Him as Commanding all the other *Gods*, sending them on his Errands, calling them to Account, and sometimes Chastizing them. He was called *Majus Deus*, the *Great God*. *Lucian* in his Dialogues brings in *Neptune* making Suit to *Mercury*, that he might speak with *Jupiter.*

But besides all these, we have sufficient Testimony in *Scripture* of the *Heathens* acknowledging the *One Supreme* and *True God*, *Nebuchadnezzar* calls him *God of Gods, and Lord of Kings*——*The most High God*——And says, *I blessed the most High, and I praised and honoured Him that Liveth for Ever and Ever, whose Dominion is an Everlasting Dominion, and His Kingdom from Generation to Generation. And all the Inhabitants of the Earth are reputed as Nothing: And He doth according to His Will in the Army of Heaven, and among the Inhabitants of the Earth: And no Man*

Dan. ii. 47. iii. 26. 29. iv. 34, 35.

Man can ſtay His Hand, or ſay unto Him, What doeſt Thou?

Ezra i. 2. vi. 10. 12. *Cyrus* calls Him the *Lord God of Heaven.* And *Darius* the ſame, in as High Expreſſi-

Dan. vi. 26. ons as any *Chriſtian* could uſe, *The Living God, and ſtedfaſt for Ever, and His Kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed, and His Dominion ſhall be even unto the End,* &c.

L. It is Strange that when they Acknowledged the Great *God* ſo fully, they did not forſake their own little *Gods.*

G. No, for they did not think it Inconſiſtent to Acknowledge One *God* above all, and yet to Suppoſe that every Nation had its own *God*, or *Gods*, in Subordination to the Supreme *God*, and as *Deputies* under Him. This was their Notion. And they ſuppoſed that *Judea* had its own Tutelar *God*, as well as other Countries. Therefore the King of *Aſſyria* having Conquered it, ſent to teach his People who went

2 Kin. xvii. 26. 27, 33. thither, *the Manner of the God of the Land*, to appeaſe His Wrath who had Plagued them with Lions. But yet they forſook not their own Gods, for it is ſaid, *They feared the Lord, and ſerved their own Gods.* And they allowed the ſame Liberty to the *Jews*, who were not Required in any of their Captivities to Renounce their own *God*; but only to Worſhip the *Gods* of the *Nations* where they lived. And of theſe Tutelar *Gods*, they ſuppoſed one might be Stronger or more Powerful than another,

and

and therefore they would Boaſt of their *Gods*, one *Country* againſt another; thus ſaid *Senacherib*, *Who are they among all the Gods of the Countries, that hath delivered their Country out of mine Hand, that the Lord* (the Tutelar *God* of *Judea*) *ſhould deliver Jeruſalem out of mine Hand? Where are the Gods of* Hamath *and of* Arpad? *&c.* When *Moſes* and *Aaron* told *Pharaoh* that the *God* of the *Hebrews* had met with them, he was not Offended that they had another *God* beſides thoſe which were Worſhipped in *Egypt*; he took it as a thing granted, that every *People* had their own Tutelar *God*. ii Kin. xviii. 34, 35.

This then was the Difference betwixt the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, the *Gentiles* thought it lawful to Worſhip the Tutelar *God* of any *Country*, but ſtill in Subordination to the *Moſt High God*, as has been ſhewed: On the other hand, the *Jews* were Obliged to Worſhip the *Lord God*, the *Supreme God*, and *Him only*, and they were forbid to Worſhip any of the *Gods* of the *Nations*.

But this Sin they often fell into, they Worſhipped theſe *Gods*, but ſtill in Conjunction with the *Lord* their *God*, as it is ſaid, they did *Worſhip and Swear by the Lord, and Swear by* Malcham. But *Samuel* told them, *If ye return unto the Lord with all your Hearts, then put away the Strange Gods, and Aſhtaroth from among you — and ſerve Him only — Then they did put away Baalim and Aſhtaroth, and ſerved the Lord only.* Zeph. i. 5. 1 Sam. vii. 3, 4.

L. But it is said, that they had *forsaken* the *Lord.*

G. It is called *forsaking* the *Lord*, when we will not Obey His *Commandments*, but Worship Him otherwise than He has Required, and join others with Him which He has forbidden. He said, *The House of Israel is Estranged from Me, Separated from Me through their Idols; yet they come and Enquire of a Prophet concerning Me.* And again, Ezek. xiv. 5. 7.

When they had slain their Children to their Idols, then came they the same Day into my Sanctuary. And He says to them, *Will ye burn Incense unto Baal, and walk after other Gods, and come and stand before Me in this House which is called by My Name?* It is said. Chap xxiii. 39. Jer. vii. 9.

They feared the Lord, and served their own Gods, after the Manner of the Nations. But it follows immediately, *They fear not the Lord, because they do not after His Statutes*, wherein He Commanded them *not to fear other Gods.* And again, *They feared the Lord, and served their graven Images.* Yet this was departing from the Fear of the *Lord*, but not a downright Denial of the *Supreme God*, or throwing him off from being any more their *God*, and taking any other *God* in his Room as the *Supreme God.* No, But it was taking other *Gods* with Him, of which He says, *Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate.* 1 Kin. xvii. 33. 34, 41. Jer. xliv. 4.

This

This was the First *Sin* against which *God* took Care to Guard in the first Commandment, *Thou shalt have none other Gods before Me*, or *with Me*. And for the Distinction that the Worship of Inferior *Gods* or *Ministers* of *God* is not here forbidden, we say, *Ubi Lex non Distinguit, ibi non est Distinguendum, Where the Law does not Distinguish, we must not*; for ther is no *Law* but may be *Distinguished* away. And this is exactly the same Notion the *Heathen* had of their *Dæmones*. And the Worshiping of these or Fearing them, is literally what we call *Superstition*. It is a *Means* of *Grace* which *God* has not appointed. Exod. xx. 3. 23.

L. But we have reason to Suspect that several of the Heathen *Dæmones*, or Men Deify'd after they were Dead, were Suppositious, and that no such Men ever were in the World.

G. Many such will be found in the Catalogue of your *Saints*. What think you of the *Seven Sleepers*, who Slept 362 Years, and thought it but One Night? What think you of the Eleven Thousand *English* Virgins, all Martyred together at *Cologne*; and the fine Legend told of them? What do you believe of St. *George* his killing the *Dragon*, and Rescuing the *King's Daughter?* As true as our Ballad of the *Dragon* of *Wantly*. Yet ther are *Days* kept for all these and *Offices* made for them, with Prayers to them, and to *God*, that we may be Saved by these their Merits. Ther are Multitudes of the like, which you will find, even to

a Surfeit, in the *Devotions of the Roman Church*, with their *Breviaries*, *Miſſals*, *Legends*, and *Authors* quoted at large. And can theſe Prayers be in *Faith*, to Perſons that never were in Being, and for the Merit of Actions that were never done? This is a *Means* of *Grace* of our own Invention indeed!

Beſides, many have been *Canonized* for Notorious *Crimes*, as our St. *Thomas Becket* of *Canterbury*, whoſe Merit was, that he would Exempt all *Eccleſiaſticks* from the *Secular* Power, though even in *Civil* or *Criminal* Cauſes, which was called Aſſerting the *Liberties* of *Holy Church*, and it is fully Aſſerted in the *Bulla in Cœna*. But notwithſtanding all theſe Authorities, it is a Wicked Principle, and diſſolves all *Civil* Government, it Exempts from the *King*'s Obedience the *Firſt* of the *three Eſtates* of the Realm, which has or ought to have the greateſt Influence upon the People; and transfers their *Allegiance* to another *Soveraign*, which is the Higheſt *Treaſon*, by the Laws of all well Governed Nations, as well as by the *Laws* of *God*. Yet for Aſſerting this *Becket* was *Canonized*; and for not giving way to it, the *King* was *Whipped* by the *Monks* of *Canterbury*, to which he was forced to Submit, in thoſe times of *Papal* Supremacy.

Such another was the Laſt Year's Saint Pope *Pious* V. the great Aſſerter and laſt Practicer of the Power of the *Pope* to Depoſe *Princes*; and who broke the Communion of the *Church* of *England*.

But

But ther is one *Saint* (truly so) of whom I have reserved to speak in the last Place, because of the Excesses of your *Church* in their *Devotions* to *Her*, bordering even upon *Blasphemy* to any Common Ear. No less than a *Canonized* Person St. *Bonaventure* has Published what he calls, *The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, wherein every one of the 150 *Psalms*, as likewise the *Te Deum*, and other most Solemn Adorations of *God*, are all turned to the Virgin *Mary*. *Rosaries* and Books of Devotion to Her are many, here is one translated into *English* for the Use of the *Roman Catholicks* here, intituled, *The Devotion of Bondage, or the Practice of perfectly Consecrating our selves to the Service of the Blessed Virgin. Permissu Superiorum*, 1632. It is Licensed and highly Recommended both to Clergy and People by the Bishop of St. *Omars*, with several *Indulgences* granted to those who shall Devoutly make use of it; wherein we offer up our selves, both *Souls* and *Bodies*, as *Bond-slaves* to the B. *Virgin:* Among whose High *Prerogatives* you will find this the *Sixth*, p. 32. *The Soveraign Dominion that was given Her, not only over the World, but over the Creator of the World.* This indeed might well Ground that Petition made to her, *Jure Matris, Impera filio. By the Right of a Mother, Command your Son.* And her being call'd *The Mother of the whole Trinity*, in the *Missal Polon.* fol. 237. In the *Primer or Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary*,

Printed in *English*, 1699. (and in the *Expoſition* before it ſaid to be of *great Antiquity*, *and Compoſed by the Church*, *directed by the Holy Ghoſt*) you will find many Prayers to the Virgin *Mary*, not only of *Interceſſion* or *Praying for us*, but to Grant us *Grace*, Pardon of *Sin*, and *Eternal Life*, in as full and poſitive Terms as could be asked of *God* himſelf. See the Hymn, *Memento rerum Conditor*, p. 34. And *Ave Maris Stella*, p. 53. And the Prayer to her, p. 59. *Under thy Aid*——*Sub tuum Præſidium*—— which is taken out of the *Roman Pontifical* in the Office for Conſecrating an *Image* of the B. *Virgin*, where we Pray for *Aid*, &c. from her ſelf directly, without mentioning any *Interceſſion*. Nay, they *Bleſs in her Name*, which was never done to any Creature. The Prieſthood was Ordained by God, to *Bleſs in his Name*. No *Apoſtle* or *Angel* ever *Bleſſed* the *People* in *his own Name*. Deut. x. 8. But in this *Primer*, p. 16. You will ſee the *Prieſt* give the *Bleſſing* in theſe Words, *The Virgin Mary*, *with her pious Son*, *bleſs us*. To which the People anſwer, *Amen*. Here the Principal Part is given to the *Virgin*, her Son only Bleſſes *with* her, and ſhe is firſt Named. But if ſhe be not Preferred, yet ſhe is here put upon the Level with her Son at leaſt, and *Bleſſes* the *People* Jointly with him.

L. Why may not the Virgin *Mary* Bleſs as well as an *Angel*? And we find that *Jacob* prayed the *Angel* might Bleſs his Grand-Sons. Gen. xlviii. 16.

G. That

G. That *Angel* was *God*, and so it is Expressed, *God, before whom my Fathers Abraham, and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all Evil, Bless the Lads.* This *Angel* was *Christ*, who often Appeared before He took Flesh. He was the *Angel* which Wrestled with this same *Jacob*, and Blessed him. He was the *Angel* appeared to *Moses* in the Bush, and said, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. which no Created *Angel* could have said. It was He who Appeared to *Joshua* as *Captain of the Host of the Lord*, and said, as before to *Moses*, *Loose thy Shoe from off thy Foot, for the Place whereon thou standest is Holy*, which no meer *Angel* ever said. So that this will be no Precedent for *Blessing* the *People* in the Name of the Virgin *Mary*. Jos. v. 14, 15.

Epiphanius reckons the Worship of the Virgin *Mary* (not then so Rank) among the *Heresies*, under the Name of the *Collyridians*, who offered *Cakes* to the *Moon* as *Queen* of *Heaven*, which is the same Name they give now to the *Virgin*, and she is Painted standing upon the *Moon* her Representive. *Epiphanius* Observes that our Blessed *Lord* foreseeing the *Superstition* that would come into the World on Account of His *Mother*, treated her always at a Distance, never once called her *Mother*, no not upon the *Cross*, or by any other Appellation than that of *Woman*, Hær. 78, 79. Jer. vii. 18. xliv. 19.

man, and checking her forwardneſs ſaid unto her, *Woman, what have I to do with*
Joh. ii. 4. *thee?* She is as little Named as poſſible in the *Goſpels*, where *Chriſt* pronounces a Greater Bleſſing to thoſe that hear
Luk. xi. 28. His Word, than to the *Womb* that Bare Him: And ſhe is not Reckoned among thoſe who ſaw Him after His *Reſurrection*. She is but once Named in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and that upon no other Account than that ſhe with other Women,
Act. i. 14. continued in the Communion of the *Apoſtles* after the *Aſcenſion* of our *Lord*: But none of her *Acts* or *Miracles* are Recorded, though Abundance in the *Legends*. And ſhe is not once Named, upon any Account whatſoever, in any of the *Epiſtles*. Strange! That this ſhould be ſo forgot, which makes now ſo great a Part in the *Devotions* of the *Church* of *Rome!*

But there is an Honour of an Extraordinary Nature paid to *Her* at the Head of all the *Saints*, in the Office of the *Maſs*, where, before the Conſecration, the Elements are Offered up to God in Memory of the *Paſſion*, *Reſurrection* and *Aſcenſion* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and for the *Honour* of the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, &c. *in Honorem beatæ Mariæ ſemper Virginis*. Did *Chriſt* then *Suffer*, *Riſe*, and *Aſcend*, for *Her* Honour? It was for the Honour and Glory of *God* indeed, but to thruſt Her in or any of the *Saints* to ſhare in this, looks a little too Familiar, and putting them, at leaſt *Her*, near upon

upon the Level with the *Almighty*, ſince more could not be ſaid to Him.

And here we may ſee a good Reaſon why *God* would not have any Religious Worſhip paid to theſe, or any *Miniſters* of His Kingdom, nor would be Worſhipped *with* them; for he ſaw ther would be Encroaching, and coming nearer to Him than was fit for the Condition of *Creatures*. They would have a Share with Him. Nay that they might come at laſt to Advance theſe above *God* Himſelf, and Prefer the *Saints* even to *Chriſt!* As it has been ſaid, *That Chriſt did nothing which St.* Francis *did not do, yea, that he did more than Chriſt himſelf.* Lib. Conform. fol. 1149.

And now we ſee the Reaſon why your *Index Expurgatorius* would not have it ſeen in the FATHERS, that *God only is to be Worſhipped*, for they have Expunged this out of the *Indices* of their Works, that they might not be found by the People, who might take Offence to ſee their Worſhip divided betwixt *God* and *Creatures*. *Adorari ſolius Dei eſt:* Deleatur ex Ind. Operum *Athanaſii* Indice Lib. Prohib. & Expurg. p. 52. *Madrit.* An. 1627. item ex In. Op. S. *Auguſt.* ibid. p. 56.

Was ther ever ſo ſhameleſs a thing done by any *Church* as to take upon them to Correct and Alter the *Fathers?* It is plainly to ſtifle the Evidence againſt themſelves: And renders every thing at leaſt *Suſpected* that they Quote out of them. And the *Scriptures* had been

been *Purged* too, but that they are so Common in the Hands of *Protestants*, that it could not be done without manifest Detection. But how far they have gone towards it, by *Mistranslations*, *Adding* or *Leaving out* some *Words*, I have shewed already. But to pursue the Subject we are now upon.

(34.) Not only the *Souls* of the *Saints* in Heaven, but their dead *Bodies* or Bits of them, a *Finger*, a *Toe*, or a *Tooth*, or a Scrap of their *Cloaths*, a *Girdle*, or a *Book*, or any thing else that they used are *Worshipped*, and made *Means* of *Grace*, and great *Miracles* said to be done by them.

L. Was not a Dead Man Raised by touching the Bones of *Elisha*? ii Kin. xiii. 21.

G. Yes, God may work *Miracles* by what *Means* he pleases. But does this Consecrate the *dead Body* of every *Saint* to be a *Means* of *Grace*, and a Worker of *Miracles*? Many *Miracles* were Wrought by the *Rod* of *Moses*; Is every *Rod* therefore a *Means* of *Grace*, either Ghostly or Bodily? Or may we Consecrate any *Rod* to be such a *Means*? Nothing is such a *Means* to us but what God has Commanded and Appointed to be Done, as *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*. It is the *Institution*, not an *Example*, that makes any thing a *Means* of *Grace* to us. Else we might go and Imitate all the *miraculous* Actions of *Moses*

Moſes or of *Chriſt*, and call them *Means* of *Grace* to us, becauſe ſo uſed by them.

But as to the *Reliques* in your Church, many of them have been notoriouſly Detected, and it has been found out, That the *dead Bodies* of *Malefactors* have been taken for the *Reliques* of *Saints*, and great *Miracles* ſaid to be done by them. The ſame *Relique* of ſuch a *Saint*, the *Head* or *Finger* is ſhewn in ſeveral Places, and each Contend that theirs is the Right, and each have *Miracles* avouched for them. Many Inſtances of this, with Vouchers undeniable, you will find in *The Devotions of the Roman Church*. How then can you Worſhip ſuch *Reliques* in *Faith*? without which it is a *Sin!*

(35.) But not only the *Saints*, and their *Reliques*, but their *Images* are with you made a diſtinct *Means* of *Grace*; for in the Conſecration of the *Image* of a *Saint*, it is ſaid, That whoever ſhall Worſhip ſuch a Saint, *coram hac Imagine*, *before this Image*, may obtain ſo and ſo, for which End the *Image* is *Bleſſed* and *Sanctified*. So that it is not enough to Worſhip the *Saint*, but if I do it *before ſuch a Conſecrated Image*, I ſhall obtain more *Grace* than otherwiſe. This makes the *Image* it ſelf a *Means* of *Grace*, for there is *Vertue* there. Why elſe would it not do as well to Pray, and not *before ſuch an Image*? Why elſe indeed are ſuch *Images* ſo formally *Conſecrated*, if there be no *Vertue* in the *Conſecration*?

tion? And why do Men go Pilgrimages, or ſend Vows to *Loretto*, or any other diſtant Place, if they think ther is no *Vertue* in the *Image* there, more than in Forty of the ſame ſort which they may have at Home? And the *Saint* Repreſented by the *Image* is as near them in the one Place as in the other; ther muſt be then ſome *Vertue* Communicated to one *Image* more than to another.

L. Then you are againſt any *Pictures* or *Images* of the *Saints*, or paying any Honour to the Holy Men departed.

G. No, My Lord, We are not ſo Stingy, We ſcruple not *Pictures* for *Ornament*, but not for *Worſhip*, or for Worſhipping *before them*, as you ſpeak. And we Honour the *Saints* departed, as far as we think Lawful, and, as we are verily Perſuaded, as far as they Deſire; ſince according to St. *Auguſtin*'s Rule before mentioned, if they Accepted our Adoration, it would Prove them to be *Evil Spirits*. And then you are to Conſider, that inſtead of *Interceſſors*, as you hope for by your Worſhip of them, they will vindicate themſelves, and become your *Accuſers*. But in our Honour of them, we firſt take Care not to ſpecify any particular Perſon as a *Saint*, but who is ſo Recorded in Holy *Scripture*; for we underſtand not *Canonizations* by *Men* who know not the *Heart*; in the next place, we limit the Honour we pay them by the Rule of God's Commandments, which we ſuppoſe moſt Pleaſing to them. We keep

particular

particular *Holy Days* for the *Apoſtles*, St. *John Baptiſt*, St. *Stephen*, &c. We bleſs God for them, commemorate their *Vertues*, and pray that we may follow their good Examples. We have One Day for All the *Saints* in General, and another for St. *Michael* and all *Angels*. Thus we Honour them, and for this we bear the Reproach of our four *Diſſenters*, as if we were too much Inclining to *Popery*. You think we give too little Honour to the *Saints*, and they think we give too much! But we hope we keep the Mean. We abſtain from the *Pictures* or *Images* of the *Saints* in our *Churches*, becauſe they have been abuſed to *Superſtition*, and to avoid Offence. But in Places not Dedicated to Worſhip, as in private Houſes, we think them not Unlawful, more than the Picture of any Good Man.

Epiphanius was very zealous againſt having them brought into *Churches*, and tells *John*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, in a Letter tranſlated by St. *Jerom*, that finding a Linnen Cloth hung up in a Church Door, (it is likely to keep out the Wind) whereon was a *Picture* of *Chriſt*, or of ſome *Saint*, he Tore it, and Ordered a dead Corps to be Buried in it. And he Lamented the *Superſtition* he ſaw coming, by theſe *Pictures* and *Images* then beginning to Creep into the *Church*.

The *Abuſe* of things, tho' otherwiſe Lawful, which are not *Inſtituted* by *God* for Standing *Means* of *Grace*, as *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, may juſtly take away the *Uſe of* them.

them. Thus the *Brazen Serpent* was appointed by God as a *Means* of *Grace* for Miraculous *Cures* in the *Wilderneſs*, and was Preſerved until the Days of *Hezekiah*, but when they burned *Incenſe* to it, it became an *Idol*, was broke to pieces and called by a Contemptible Name *Nehuſhtan*, that is, *A Bit of Braſs*. How much more Reaſon is there to Remove the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Saints* (which God never Appointed) out of our *Churches*, when we ſee *Incenſe* burned to them, and they *Worſhipped* in your *Churches*, as *Means* of *Grace*. And yet there is no Evil in the *Pictures* themſelves.

2 Kin. xviii. 4.

(36) But there is One *Picture* I think has Evil in it, and is Unlawful any where; and yet it is ſeen in your *Churches*, and commonly over the *Altar*, that is, the *Picture* or *Image* of *God* the *Father*, like an *Old Man*, &c. We are forbid to *Make* it, and then we cannot *Worſhip* it. See how poſitively God forbids it, *Take good heed unto your ſelves, for ye ſaw no manner of Similitude* (that is of *God*) *in the Day that the Lord ſpake unto you-leſt ye Corrupt your ſelves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure, the Likeneſs of Male or Female*, &c. And again, *They changed the Glory of the Uncorruptible God into an Image made like to Corruptible Man*, &c.

Deut. iv. 15, &c.

Rom. i. 23.

L. Both theſe *Texts* are Quoted and Anſwered in our *Catechiſm ad Parochos*, upon the *Firſt*

First Commandment, and the Answer is this, (*a*) That the Sin here forbidden is to Paint or Carve *Imaginem Divinitatis*, *A Picture or Image of the Divinity*, or of the *Divine Nature*.

G. Pray, My Lord, did you ever know a *Painter* or *Statuary* who Attempted to draw a *Picture* or make an *Image* of a *Thought*, or of a *Soul*?

L. No, for they cannot be seen. *Pictures* and *Images* are made for the *Eye*. How then can a *Likeness* or *Similitude* be drawn of what is *Invisible*?

G. And is not the Great *God* more *Invisible*, and the *Divine Nature* much more *Incomprehensible* even to our *Thoughts* or *Imagination*? *How* then can it be Represented to our *Eye*? I dare say, there never was a Man since *Adam* who would own any such thing, or ever had so foolish a Thought. No, but when they drew any *Picture* or *Similitude* of *God*, it was only meant to Express some of His *Attributes* or *Perfections*; as by *Fire* His *Purity*, by a Giant with Many *Hands* His *Power*, with Many *Eyes* His *Providence*, &c. And so you own that by an *Old Man* you only mean to Express His *Antiquity*. And will not this Excuse the *Heathen*, as well as you? See the same Excuse made by *Maximus Tyrius*, *Dissert.* 38. *Whether Statues were to be made for the Gods*? But here you would put an *Impossible* Meaning upon the *Prohibition*

(*a*) De Cultu & Invocatione Sanctorum. *Sect.* xxxiv. xxxv.

hibition of *God*, to make it of no Effect, and which will Excuſe the *Heathens* as much as your ſelves.

L. Our *Catechiſm ad Parochos* (which is our *Text*) in the Place laſt Quoted, *Sect.* xxxiv. teaches us, That the *Heathen* when they made *Images* of *Serpents*, *Beaſts*, &c. they Worſhipped all theſe as *God*. *Hæc enim omnia tanquam Deum venerabantur.* And that the *Iſraelites* thought the ſame of the *Golden Calf*, for that they ſaid, *Theſe are the Gods that brought thee out of Egypt*, and therefore that they were *Idolaters*, becauſe they thus (*a*) *Changed their Glory into the Similitude of a Calf that eateth Graſs.*

G. It is very Abſurd to ſay, That the *Heathen* thought their *Images* to be the things of which they were the *Images*. That was Impoſſible, for then they would not be the *Images* but the *Things* themſelves. Who ever ſaid, that a Man's *Picture* was himſelf? Though they are called the *Perſons*, as when we look upon *Pictures* we ſay, *This is ſuch a Man*, *or ſuch a Man:* But if any ſhould put it upon us, that we meant the *Perſons* themſelves, we muſt think them *Idiots* or *School-Men*, that loved Diſtinctions and Wrangling. *Maximus Tyrius* in the *Diſſertation* before Quoted, tells us, that they had many *Images* of the ſame God, as of *Venus*, *Diana*, &c. and yet that they did not think there was more than one *Venus* or one *Diana*

(*a*) Pſal cvi. 20.

Diana. Have not you Multitudes of the *Pictures* and *Images* of the Virgin *Mary?* And yet you say not that ther is more than one such *Virgin.* Now the *Heathen* Worshipped their *Images*, and if you believe your own *Catechism*, you must think that they took every one for *God*, for *Hæc omnia*, they worshipped all these as *God*!

And it is as absurd to think that they took that *Serpent* or *Beast* whose *Image* they made, to be *God*. Or if they meant not any particular *Serpent* or *Ox* (for Example) by the *Image*, they must think every *Ox* or *Serpent* to be *God!* But they were not so Ridiculous, as *Maximus Tyrius*, and all, as many of them as have wrote, will satisfy you. But that they made Use of their *Images* only as *Symbols*, which being *Dedicated* to such a *God*, they thought that this *God* would afford his Presence with his *Symbol*, and by it secure to them his Favour and Protection. How near your *Consecration* comes to their *Dedication* of *Images*, I leave to your selves to judge. But you put such monstrous things upon the *Heathen*, as they Disown, Detest, and Abhor. And yet you must do it, that your Case and theirs may not appear so very like.

But you must draw in the *Jews* too, else all this will stand you in no stead. And you have no Mercy upon them, you suppose them full as Ignorant as you have made the *Heathen*. They must believe that the *Golden Calf*, on the same Day they made it, to be the Great *God*

Who made themſelves and all the World, and to have brought them out of *Egypt* long before it ſelf was made! But the *Jews* will not let this go with you more than the *Heathen*. They were not quite ſo fooliſh. They had learned the Uſe of *Images* and *Symbols* in *Egypt*. And it is plain they did here Imitate it. They had ſeen *Oſiris* worſhipped in *Egypt* under the Figure of an *Ox*, from which they took their Figure of the *Calf*. And it was to ſecure *God*'s Preſence among them, upon the Suppoſed Loſs of *Moſes*, by whom they had Received their *Law* from *God*, and Directions from *Him* upon all Occaſions. But *Moſes* had been abſent from them 40 Days, and took neither Meat nor Drink with him, ſo that they thought he had been quite Gone or Dead, and that they ſhould never See him more. And then how ſhould they do to Secure the Preſence of *God* among them? And they took to this way of an *Image* or *Symbol* of *God*, not that they forſook *God*, but to take Care that *He* might not forſake them. And they meant *His* Worſhip in that of the *Golden Calf*. Therefore they Proclaimed the *Dedication* of it, (*a*) *A Feaſt unto the Lord*. And that it was wholly for the Want of *Moſes* they did it, (by whom they had found, by long Experience, the Preſence of *God* Secured among them) they themſelves gave the Reaſon: (*b*) *Up* (ſaid they) *make us Gods which*

(*a*) Exod. xxxii. 5. (*b*) Ver. 1.

which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the Man that brought us up out of the Land of Egypt, we Wot not what is become of him.

Pray, My Lord, let me ask you, suppose it were made *Treason* to *draw* a *Picture* of the King, or to *Bow* to it: Would you venture your *Life* upon all these *Distinctions* and *Excuses* which are made for the *Pictures* of God? Yet we venture our *Souls* upon it, if it be a *Sin*: And though we think it may be Beneficial to us, as putting us in Mind of Him, or paying Respect unto Him.

Now by this let us learn how Dangerous a thing it is to make *Means* of *Grace* of our own Invention, and to think that by our *Consecrations* or *Dedications*, without Warrant of God's *Word*, we can secure his Presence with us, and Procure the *Grace* of Health or any Benefit either to Body or Soul. This is turning *Religion* into *Superstition*.

(37.) But the strangest Instance of this that ever was in the World is that of *Transubstantiation*, a meer *School-nicety* which no Man alive Understands, and yet Transformed into an Article of *Faith* by the Council of *Trent*.

Christ said, *This is my Body*, but as to the *Manner* or *Means* how it was so, He said not a Word; whether only *Sacramentally*, *Figuratively*, or *Symbolically*: Or on the other hand, whether, *Substantially*, *Con-substantially*, or *Transubstantially*. These are Inventions of our own, from our poor *Philosophy!* And yet about these

is our whole Dispute; which has Tormented the *Christian Church* in our later Age more than all the other *Mysteries* of *Religion*. Had we kept to the Words of *Institution* as *Christ* left them, and gone no further, there might have been various *Opinions* in the *Schools* concerning the *Manner* of the *Presence* of *Christ*, in the *Sacrament*; and they who had nothing else to do might have spent their idle Hours, and vain Distinctions about it: But it had never broke the *Communion* of the *Church*, if it had not been adopted into an Article of *Faith*, and made a *Condition* of *Communion*: And now we must dispute it. And the first thing I have to say is, That it seems very strange there should be any Dispute about it. For our *Saviour* was then fulfilling a *Type* of himself which was the *Passover*, and he kept to the same *Phrase* or *Form of Words* which was Customary with the *Jews* in their Celebration of it, only putting *Himself* in the Room of His *Type*, as instead of *This is the Paschal Lamb which was slain for us in Egypt*, He said, *This is my Body which is given for you.* And when *Moses* sprinkled the *Blood*, it was with this Form of Words, (*a.*) *This is the Blood of the Testament which God hath Enjoyned unto you.* Instead of which *Old Testament*, *Christ* said, (*b.*) *This is my Blood of the New Testament.* In which Words there is no Difficulty at all, for no Mortal ever understood these Words of *Moses*

(*a*) *Heb.* ix. 20. (*b*) *Matth.* xxvi. 28.

ſes in a *Tranſ-ſubſtantial* Senſe, and why ſhould they the ſame Words when *Chriſt* ſpoke them, following the very Form of the Words of *Moſes?* This made it Familiar and Eaſie to the *Apoſtles*, who called many things *Hard ſayings* which were not ſo Difficult as this, and yet Expreſſed no Wonder or Aſtoniſhment at theſe Words of *Chriſt*, which had been impoſſible for them not to have done, if they had taken them in the Senſe of *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation*, for it was a new Thing never before Heard or Thought of in the World! To deny all their *Senſes* at once!

L. I wonder you ſhould ſtand ſo much upon this, you Object your *Senſes* and your *Reaſon*, and yet you muſt give them both up in the Myſtery of the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, &c.

G. No, My Lord, I muſt give neither of them up, for I cannot believe any *Revelation* but by my *Reaſon*, upon the *Evidence* that appears for it: And my *Reaſon* tells me that there muſt be many things in the Infinite Nature which I cannot Comprehend, and therefore I acquieſce in the *Revelation*, being once fully ſatisfied of it. This I have Diſcourſed already. But for the other Point that of Contradicting my outward *Senſes*, I think it an Invincible Objection.

L. Why? Muſt you not give *them* up too, as to the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation?*

G. Not at all, My Lord, they Contradict none of my *Senſes*. Pray tell me, which of

them do they Contradict? Is it the *Senſe* of *Seeing*, *Hearing*, or *Smelling*?

L. They are not Objects of *Senſe.*

G. Therefore they Contradict them not. But in *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation* they are every one Contradicted. And I ſtand upon it, That ſince the Creation of the World *God* never Did or Said any thing which Contradicted the *Senſe* of any Man. It would be Deſtroying the Certainty of every thing. *Miracles* are Appeals to our *Senſes*, and without believing our *Senſes*, we can Truſt to no *Miracle*, and Conſequently to no *Revelation.*

L. I mean not a general Diſbelief of our Senſes in every thing, bnt if a *Revelation* (you are ſatisfied is true) ſhould bid you diſbelieve your *Senſes*, in ſuch a Particular only ——

G. It is a needleſs Suppoſition, for there is no ſuch *Revelation.* But if there were, if an *Angel* ſhould Appear to me, and bid me believe that I ſaw Him, but not to believe any thing elſe that I ſaw of a hundred things I ſaw round about him; I ſhould without more a do either believe that I ſaw the other things I did ſee, or if I muſt not believe I ſaw *them*, I ſhould not believe I ſaw *Him.* And I take it as a Certain Rule, that we muſt either believe our Senſes in *Every thing* or in *Nothing.* Had not the *Apoſtles* at the *Lord's Supper* as much Reaſon to Doubt whether it was *Chriſt* they ſaw, and that He ſpoke to them, as that it was *Bread* which they Saw and Eat? If you come once to *deceptio Viſus*, it will go quite through, and

you

you cannot be ſure of one thing more than of another; becauſe the Fault is in the *Eye*, not in the *Objects*. So that if *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation* be true, there is nothing elſe in the World true but it!

And it is no ſmall Prejudice to this *Miracle* of *Miracles*, and Contradiction to it ſelf and to all other *Miracles*, and to Every thing elſe in the World, That it ſhould be put upon us juſt for —— nothing —— but to Stagger our *Faith*, and make us Doubt of Every thing!

For if all the Benefits of the Death of Chriſt be Conveyed to us in this Sacrament, by a *Figurative* and *Symbolical* Repreſentation of his *Body* and *Blood*, and that it be ſo inſtituted for this End; it is to all Intents and Purpoſes as Beneficial to us, as if we had Eat the *Fleſh* of *Chriſt* off his *Bones*, or Drank the very *Blood*, that came out of His *Side*; which is abhorrent to think, and to Avoid which you call this an *Unbloody* Sacrifice. But how is it *Unbloody*, if it be Real *Blood*, even the ſelf ſame *Blood* that was ſhed upon the *Croſs*? Yet you your ſelves allow, that this muſt be taken in a *Spiritual* not a *Carnal* Senſe, becauſe *Chriſt* Himſelf ſaid, ſpeaking of this *Sacrament* (as you own) and to ſolve that *hard ſaying* at which many were *offended*, of giving them his *Fleſh* to *Eat*, He made it eaſie to them by this Explanation, (*a*) *It is the Spirit that Quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing; the Words that I ſpeak unto you they are Spirit, and they are Life.* May we not then take his Words in a *Spiritual* Senſe?

(*a*) *Joh.* vi. 63.

L. But you would have the Words of *Inſtitution* taken *Figuratively*, as when *Chriſt* ſaid, *I am a Vine, I am a Door*, &c.

G. There is not one Man in your Communion but muſt own that the Words of *Inſtitution are Figurative*, for Example, (*a*) *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my* Blood, *which is ſhed for you.* Here is firſt, the *Cup* for the *Wine*, by a *Metonymie*, called *Continens pro Contento.* Then the *Cup* being the *New Teſtament*, I ſuppoſe you will allow is another *Figure.* And it is another, to ſay *which is ſhed*, for *which ſhall be ſhed*, for his Blood was not then *ſhed.* This laſt *Figure* you have Boldly avoided in your *Maſs*, where it is put *Effundetur*, *ſhall be ſhed*, inſtead of *Effunditur*, or *Effuſum*, according to the *Greek* ἐκχυνόμενον. However the Two Former *Figures* ſtand Unalterable.

But to ſhew that the Words were *Figurative*, and that the *Elements* did not loſe their *Nature* by the *Conſecration*, they are called by their own *Names* after the *Conſecration*, as the *Wine* is called the (*b*) *Fruit of the Vine*, after the *Conſecration.* And it is called Bread which they Eat in the *Sacrament.* And we are called *Bread* becauſe we partake of that *Bread.* We are *Bread* by the ſame *Figure* that *Bread* is *Fleſh.*

L. We believe that there is no Bread in the *Sacrament*, but we are ſure we are not Bread.

G.

(*a*) Luk. xxii. 20. (*b*) Matth. xxvi. 29. Mark xiv. 25. 1 Cor. 15. xi. 26, 27, 28.

G. You are no more ſure of the one, than of the other. But ſee now the Arbitrarineſs of your Interpretation, when it is ſaid of *Bread*, *This is Fleſh*, that is ſo very *Plain* it muſt be taken *Literally*: But when it is ſaid of the *Bread* in the Sacrament, *This is Bread*, the Expreſſion is ſo *Obſcure*, that it muſt be taken *Figuratively!* Is not this Deſtroying the *Meaning of all Expreſſions*, to take Words *Figuratively* or *Literally* juſt as you think fit, and contrary to the common Uſage as underſtood in all other things?

L. No, it is not as we think fit, but as the Ancient *Church* and *Fathers* did Underſtand it. Here we Stick.

G. And to this we Appeal. *Tertullian* ſays, that *Chriſt* made the *Bread* His BODY, by ſaying, (*a*) *This is My Body*, that is, the *Figure* of My *Body*.

Origen ſays of it, that it goes into the Belly, like other Meat, and ſo into the Draught, but ſays he ſpeaks (*b*) concerning the *Typical* and *Symbolical* Body of *Chriſt* in the Sacrament.

It was ſaid of the *Body* of *Chriſt*, that it (*c*) *ſhould not ſee Corruption*. But we know the *Sacrament* will *Corrupt*, therefore it is not the *Same*.

Theodoret likewiſe calls it the (*d*) *Symbols* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*. And ſays, that

(*a*)

(*a*) *Hoc eſt Corpus Meum*, id eſt, *Figura Corporis Mei*. Contr. Marcion. l. iv. c. xl. (*b*) *Hæc quidem de Typico Symbolicoque Corpore*. In Matth. c. xv. (*c*) Pſal. xvi. 10. Act. ii. 27. 31. (*d*) Τὰ σύμβολα τῦ σώμα]Ο & τῦ Δεσπότικῦ & τῦ αἵμα]Ο. Dial. 2.

(a) upon their *Consecration* they are Changed indeed, and made other things, but still remain in their own proper *Nature*, and *Substance*, and *Shape*, and *Form*, and are *Visible* and *Tangible*, as they were before.

And writing against the *Eutychians*, who said that the *Human Nature* of *Christ* was Absort or Swallowed up in His *Divinity*, so that their Remained now none but the *Divine Nature* in Him, and that he was no more a *Man*, and used this Comparison, That is was in like Manner as in the *Sacrament*, where the *Bread* was Changed into the *Body* of *Christ*; (b) *Yes*, said *Theodoret*, *it is in the same Manner, that is, in no Manner at all*; for that the *Bread* though Changed in its Use and Significancy, yet lost not its *Nature*, but Remained truly and properly *Bread* as before. But had he believed *Transubstantiation*, this had been a full and absolute Confirmation of the *Eutychian* Heresy, instead of a Confutation; for then there had Remained no more of the *Humane Nature* in *Christ*, than you believe the *Substance* of the *Bread* to Remain in the *Sacrament*. This explains the Meaning of *Theodoret*, even beyond his Words, and he says in the same Place, *That our Blessed Saviour, Who called Himself the Living Bread and Wine, hath also honoured the Visible Signs with the Title and Appellation of His Body and Blood, not Changing their Nature, but adding to Nature, Grace.*

Pope

(a) Μένει γὰρ ὅπερ ἦν πρότερος φύσεως, οὐσίας, καὶ τῷ σχήματι, καὶ τῷ εἴδει, καὶ ὁρατὰ ὄντα, καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *Ibid.*

(b) See his Dialogue called *The Immoveable.*

Pope *Gelasius* says, (*a*) *That the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we take, is a Divine thing, by which we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature. And yet it ceases not to be the Substance and Nature of Bread and Wine: And certainly* (says he) *the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood is Celebrated in the Mysteries.*

And *Facundus* says the same, (*b*) *Not* (says he) *that the Bread is properly His Body, or the Cup His Blood; but that they contain the Mystery of His Body and Blood.*

And St. *Augustin* says, (*c*) *If Sacraments did not bear some Similitude to the things of which they are the Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all: But from this Similitude, they often take the Name of the things themselves.—As,* says he, *the Sacrament of Faith, which is Baptism, is called Faith.*

And St. *Chrysostome* speaking of the Vessels in which the Sacrament was put, (*d*) *In which,* says he, *there is not the true Body of Christ, but the Mystery of His Body is Contained in them.*

But,

(a) *Et tamen non desinit esse Substantia vel Natura Panis & Vini: Et certe Imago & Similitudo Corporis & Sanguinis Christi in Actione Mysteriorum celebrantur.* Gelas. contr. Nestorium & Eutychetem. (*b*) Non quod propriè Corpus Ejus sit Panis, & Poculum Sanguis; sed quod Mysterium Corporis Ejus, Sanguinisq; contineant. *Lib.* ix. *c.* v. (*c*) *Si Sacramenta*, &c. Ep. xxiii. And. contr. *Faust. Manich.* l. x. c. ii. *Sic Sacramentum Fidei quod Baptismus intelligitur, Fides est.* (*d*) *In quibus non est Verum Corpus Christi, sed Mysterium Corporis Ejus continetur.* See St. *Chrysost.* opere imperf. in *Matth.* and *Epist. ad Cæsarium*, in *Biblioth. P.* Colon. 1618.

But, My Lord, not to trouble you with more Quotations, I refer you to Bishop *Cosin* his *History of Transubstantiation*, where beginning at the *Institution*, he sets down in every *Century*, the Words of the *Fathers* upon this Point. A little Book, long Printed both in *English* and *Latin*, not yet Answered (that I hear) and I believe Unanswerable, wherein you will see a Cloud of Witnesses, through the first Ages of the Church, and so downwards, in perfect Contradiction to this New Article of your *Faith*.

And as the *Scriptures*, primitive *Church* and *Fathers* are all against you, so have you nothing in the World on your Side, but an Unintelligible *Jargon* of *Metaphysicks*, upon which the *School-Men* ring Changes, till the Noise of their Bells have deafen'd Common *Sense* and *Reason*. Such are their Sultilties upon *Substance*, *Accidents*, *Subsistence*, *Modusses*, and *Modalities*, and many more such *Quiddities*; and their *Distinctions* of *Materialiter* and *Formaliter*, *per se & per Accidens*, and a Thousand more, to Solve all *Difficulties*, and Reconcile *Contradictions!* No Absurdity can be named out of the Reach of a *Distinction*. And when we Understand it not, it Operates most Effectually, because then we may suppose there is something in it! Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, Do you know the Difference betwixt *Substance* and *Accident?*

L. *Subſtance* is that which *Sub ſtat*, ſtands under or ſupports another thing, So the *Subſtance* ſtands by it ſelf, and the *Accidents* do Adhere or Stick in it: Therefore we ſay, that *Eſſentia Accidentis eſt Inhærentia*, that *Inherence* or *In-ſticking* is the *Eſſence* or very *Being* of an *Accident*, ſo that there cannot be an *Accident* without it, for whatever *Sticks* muſt have ſomething to *Stick* in.

G. When the *Subſtance* then is Gone, what becomes of the *Accidents*:

L. They are no more, for their *Eſſence* is Gone, which is *Inherence*, and they cannot *Inhere* or *Stick* in Nothing.

G. Now to Apply this, when the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Sacrament* is Gone, as you ſuppoſe, then their *Accidents* are no more, for there cannot be *Accidents* of *Nothing*, *Nothing* has no *Accidents*. And they cannot be the *Accidents* of *Bread* when there is no *Bread*. (*a*) And you will not Endure they ſhould be called the *Accidents*, of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*: Therefore they are the *Accidents* of *Nothing*, that is, they are *Accidents* and *no Accidents*: They are *Accidents* without the *Eſſence* of *Accidents*, which is *Inherence*: There is *Roundneſs* and nothing *Round*, *Whiteneſs* and nothing *White*, a *Taſte* and nothing *Taſted*, *Liquidneſs* and nothing *Liquid*, &c. And if theſe *Accidents* ſtand by themſelves, why are they not *Subſtances*?

(*a*) *Catechiſ. ad. Paroch. de Euchariſt. Sacram.* Sect. xxv. xliv.

ſtances? For that is the Definition you give of *Subſtance*. If you ſay they ſtand by *Miracle*, then by *Miracle* they are *Subſtances*. And there is an End of the *Jargon!* But who ſees not that *Roundneſs* without any thing *Round*, and the like which you call *Accidents*, are nothing at all in Nature, but Abſtracted *Notions* of our own Heads, *Creatures* of our making, which, like *Ens Rationis*, have no *Exiſtence* but in our *Brains*. Yet we Diſpute about theſe, as if they were Real things, which we come at laſt to *Fancy*, by their being Dinned ſo long in our Ears at the *Schools*: And we Fight for them, as *pro Aris & Focis*, we make them *Articles* of our *Faith*, and *Excommunicate* for them!

L. Notwithſtanding your Ridiculing *Philoſophy*, you will not ſay, that we can *See* the *Subſtance* of any thing. But that whatever comes under our outward *Senſes*, that is, whatever can be *Seen*, *Felt*, *Heard*, *Smelled*, or *Taſted*, are only the *Accidents* of things.

G. And the ſame *Philoſophy* will tell me that neither can *Accidents* be *Seen*, *Felt*, &c. For example, a *Round* or a *White* thing is a *Subſtance*, but the *Roundneſs* or the *Whiteneſs* are the *Accidents*; Now I cannot *See* or *Feel*, *Roundneſs* or *Whiteneſs*, they are only *Conceptions* in my *Mind*, and come not under any of my outward *Senſes*, they are too *Thin* to bear either my *Sight*, *Smell*, *Touch* or *Taſt*. Nay, I will ſay that they are beyond my *Imagination* too, for who can *Think* of *Roundneſs* or *Whiteneſs*, without

out some *Thing* that is *Round* or *White?* Therefore if I *See* or *Feel* any *Thing*, it is the *Substance* I *See* or *Feel*, that is, some *Thing* which is *Round* or *White*. What *Colour*, *Taſt* or *Smell*, has *Inſticking* or *Inherence?* For that is *Accident*. Is it more like *Bread* than a *Tulip*? Thus eaſily may we Diſpute our ſelves not only out of our *Senſes*, but out of our *Thoughts* too: And the *Miracle* of *Accidents* without *Subſtance*, muſt not only work upon our *Senſes*, but give us New *Thoughts*, new *Conceptions*, which never before came into the *Head* of Mortal Man! This is that *Philoſophy* and *Vain Deceit* or *Fallacy* which the *Apoſtle* ſays (*a*) will *Spoil* or Hurt our *Faith*. Doting *about Queſtions and Strifes of Words—Perverſe Diſputings——and Oppoſitions of Science falſly ſo called: which ſome Profeſſing, have Erred concerning the Faith.*

But if you are in Earneſt about this *Logick* of *Subſtance* and *Accident*, will you lay a good *Wager* upon it?

L. Hudibras ſays, *Fools for Arguments lay Wagers.*

G. Yet you have laid all your *Honour* and *Eſtate* upon it——But are you ſo ſure of it that you would take your *Oath* upon it?

L. Theſe are Fooliſh Queſtions, and were never Aſked in any School Diſpute.

G. Nor ought to be, if you had let them ſtay there. But when you will bring them out of your *Schools* into your *Creed*, and make them Articles of *Faith*, you do as good as take your

(*a*) Cor. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 4. 5, 20, 21.

your *Oath* upon the Truth and Certainty of them; and you Guard them with *Anathema's*. And it is Impoſſible you can believe *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation*, or know any thing of it, unleſs you be perfectly Skilled in the Nature and Difference of *Subſtance* and *Accident*, and how far their Powers do Reach. You muſt Diſtinguiſh between *Sub-ſtantiation*, *Con-ſubſtantiation*, and *Trans-ſubſtantiation*, and Determine whether the Nature of *Accidents* will beſt Agree with *Sub*, *Con*, or *Trans*.

L. I trouble not my Head with any of theſe things, but I believe as the *Church* believes, and there is an End of it.

G. Can you believe as the *Church* believes, without knowing what She believes? This is believing Nothing, It is *Implicit* indeed! At this Rate you need but one Article of your *Creed*, to believe the *Holy Catholick Church*. And all the Reſt may go off *Implicitly*, though you ſhould know nothing of any other of the *Articles*. And what a Man knows nothing of, he can give no *Reaſon* for. But St. *Peter* bids us (*a*) *be Ready always to give an Anſwer to every Man that asketh us a Reaſon of the Hope* (or Faith) *that is in us*. Which Suppoſes our Underſtanding it our ſelves, and not an *Implicit* Faith in others, of we know not what.

So that if you make *Trans-ſubſtantiation* an *Article*

(*a*) 1 Pet. iii. 15.

Article of your *Faith*, you are obliged to Underſtand it aright.

But there is ſomething yet more Terrible behind, for if there be no *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation*, then you Worſhip *Bread* and *Wine* with *Latria*, by which you mean the *Supreme Worſhip* due to *God* alone.

Nay tho' *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation* were Granted, and fully Underſtood, yet it is Impoſſible for any Man to know whether he *Worſhips* plain *Bread* and *Wine*, or the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*? Becauſe in the *Rubrick* of the *Maſs*, *de Defectibus circa Miſſam*, there are ſeveral Caſes put wherein the *Conſecration* is void, and ther is no *Sacrament* made, and then ther is Nothing there but plain *Bread* and *Wine*. One of theſe Caſes is, if ther be a greater Mixture of any other *Grain* than of *Wheat* in the *Wafer*, Another is, if the *Wine* be made of *Sour Grapes*, or *Grapes* not *Ripe*, *Si Vinum fit ex Uvis acerbis*, *vel non Maturis*, which is pretty hard to know for the People, who never Taſt it, or the *Worſhippers* who See or Taſt neither but only a *Pixis* or a *Cup* they look not into: And in both theſe Caſes (beſides others) it is ſaid, *Non conficitur Sacramentum*, ther is no *Sacrament* made. And ſo it is ſaid if the *Intention* of the *Prieſt* be wanting, which is Impoſſible to know: Upon which Head they put a pleaſant Caſe, as Suppoſe a Prieſt *Intends* to Conſecrate *Ten* Wafers (for Example) and after Conſecration ther be found *Eleven* or more, then None of them are Conſecrated, becauſe the *Intention* going only to

Ten, it cannot be known which these *Ten* are. But if there be *Nine* or fewer, they are all consecrated, because the *Intention* going to *Ten*, it Includes all within that Number. Besides you must take it wholly upon Trust, whether there be any *Consecration* at all; because your *Priests* do not *Consecrat* before the *People* when they Administer the *Sacrament*, but at Set times they *Consecrat* Numbers of *Wafers* together, which they Reserve for Occasions, and for daily *Worship*. Again it is said in some Cases, *Dubium est an conficiatur Sacramentum*, that it is *Doubtful* whether the *Sacrament* is made or not. And what shall we do in this Case? Is it a *Doubt* whether we Worship *God* or a *Creature*? Or is it *Indifferent* to which we give *Latria*?

L. If there should be a Mistake in any of these Matters, and we Worship meer *Creatures*, not knowing it, for which we have been Charged with *Idolatry*, we have an Answer ready, That this could amount to no more than *Material* Idolatry, but it could not be *Formally* so, while our *Intention* was Right, and we Meant our Worship to *God*.

G. These *School-Distinctions* are *Cobwebs*, and will bear no Weight, for *Material* Idolatry is *Idolatry*, else it were not *Material Idolatry*. And if our *Intention* will solve it, it will solve it also as to the *Heathen*, who Directed their *Worship* and Referred it Ultimately to the true *God*, as has been shewn. But I hope you will not make *Solomon* so stupid as you have made the

Heathen

Heathen, and to think that he believed *(a) Aſhteroth* the Goddeſs of the *Zidonians*, and *Milcom* the Abomination of the *Ammonites* and the other *Gods* of the Nations whom he Worſhipped, to be every one of them the one only *Supreme God!* Yet he is Charged with *Idolatry*, whether *Material* or *Formal* is not the Queſtion, nor is there a Word of it in the *Scriptures*, for *Idolatry* is *Idolatry*, let it be of what ſort it will. And theſe *Diſtinctions* are only to Excuſe it, and let it looſe among us. *God* has forbidden it Generally, of every Kind and Sort. The *Arians* were Charged with *Idolatry* for worſhipping *Chriſt*, ſuppoſing Him but a *Creature:* And they were ſo far from Diſowning the True *God*, that it was His Honour they pretended in denying *Divinity* to *Chriſt*. So of the *Socinians*, and our *Unitarians* among us, who give themſelves that Name for their Supporting the *Unity* of the *Godhead*. Yet they are Charged with *Idolatry* for Worſhipping *Chriſt* as an *Inferior God*. And they have the ſame Diſtinction as you of *Latria* and *Dulia*, a higher and lower Degree of Worſhip. But all *Religious* Worſhip is forbiddon to any but to *God* alone. Theſe *Degrees* of it are of Humane Invention, to Excuſe our Breach of the Commands of God. But we are to keep far from the Forbidden thing, not Try how Near we can come to it, by *Diſtinctions* of our own Coyning. We ought to *make a Hedge about the Law*, as the

(a) 1. Kin. xi. 5.

Phraſe of the *Jews* was, to Guard againſt any Approaches towards the Breach of it. Or in the Apoſtle's Words, to (*a*) *Abſtain from all Appearance of Evil.* And remember that we venture our *Souls* upon theſe *Diſtinctions.* Which then are in the Safeſt Way, we who follow the Direct *Rule* of *God's Commandments* as they are plainly laid down to us in Holy *Scripture*, without (*b*) *Turning to the Right Hand or to the Left, without either Adding to them, or Diminiſhing from them*, as we are Commanded: Or you who *Diſtinguiſh* the plaineſt *Precepts*, and make them ſpeak *Metaphyſicks?*

By which the Worſhip of the *Devil* may be Juſtified, for it is Plain that when he offer'd to our *Saviour* all the *Kingdoms* of the *World*, he meant not that he was the *Supreme God* and *Sovereign Diſpoſer* of them, but only as having Received this Power from the *Sovereign Diſpoſer*, for he ſaid, (*c*) *That is Delivered unto me, and to whomſoever I will, I give it.* And it is as Plain by the Anſwer our *Saviour* gave him, *Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and Him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* That all ſort of *Religious Worſhip* was forbidden to be given to Any but to God only. And S. *Auguſtine* makes all to be *Devils* who *Require* or *Accept* it: *Latria* and *Dulia* ſignifie both the ſame thing, that is *Service*, and here all *Religious Service* is Reſerved to *God* only. The *Diſtinction* of the *Schools* is *vain*, and meant only to Elude the Commands of *God*, and Introduce all *Superſtition.* Ther

(*a*) 1 Theſſ. v. 12. (*b*) Deut. iv. 2. v. 32. (*c*) Luk. iv. 6. 8.

Ther are other unworthy Caſes put in the *Rubrick* of the *Maſs*, which flow from hence, as if a *Dog* or a *Mouſe* ſhould eat the *Sacrament*—— If the *Prieſt* ſhould *Vomit* it up again, in which Caſe, he is to *Lick* it up *Reverently*, unleſs it be *Nauſeous*, (that was well put in) and then it is to be Diſpoſed of ſo and ſo. And again, if a *Fly* ſhould Drop into the *Cup*, how the *Fly* was to be Dealt with—— And one Reaſon given for taking the *Cup* from the *Laity* was, That the *Laity* (at that time I ſuppoſe) wore Long Beards, and leſt the *Blood* of *Chriſt* ſhould Drop upon them, or Stick to their Whiskers! All theſe are the genuine Effects of *Superſtition*, occaſioned by the Notion of *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation*.

And here, My Lord, let me obſerve, That the Natural Effect of *Superſtition* is *Atheiſm* or *Deiſm*. As one Extreme runs into another, like *Eaſt* to *Weſt*. For Men of Senſe muſt find out the Deceit that is in *Superſtition*, and then placing all *Religion* on the ſame foot (as in your Communion upon the Authority of your *Church*) they muſt think the whole to be a *Deceit*, or in the Modiſh Word, *Prieſt-Craft*, and the Contrivance of thoſe who Gain by it. Whence it is, that the *Holy Scriptures* and the *Legends* have the ſame Foundation in the Church of *Rome*, that is, her *Authority*; therefore the Common People believe them both alike, and the Men of Senſe believe neither. And this does ſo lead towards the General *Defection* foretold, that in a great Mea-

ſure it is it ; for it deſtroys the Foundation of *Religion*, and turns it all to *Superſtition*. And when the *Infidelity* which that begets ſhall come to be Publickly owned, then where ſhall *Faith* be found upon the Earth? It is now *acted* in the *Opus Operatum*. And inſtead of the *Two Sacraments* which *Chriſt* has Appointed as a *Means* of *Grace*, the whole *Face* of your *Religion* is covered with ten Thouſand of your own Invention. The Unlimited Power taken in your *Church* of *Conſecrating* every thing into a *Means* of *Grace*, your Worſhip of *Saints* (many of them *Legendary)* their *Reliques* and *Images*, of *Croſſes*, and of the *Hoſt*, make up the Bulk of your *Religion* and *Devotions*.

(38.) But not only the *Hoſt*, or *Body* of *Chriſt* ſuppoſed to be *Corporally* in the *Sacrament*, but the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*, or any *Effigies* of that *Croſs*; and the *Images* of *Chriſt*, are Worſhipped in your Church with the Supreme Divine Adoration of *Latria*. As is told us by a Great *St.* of your *Church*, whom you call the *Angelical Doctor*, St. *Thomas Aquinas*, who ſays that *(a) Crux Chriſti eſt Adoranda Adoratione Latriæ*. And again, *Crucis Effigies in aliqua alia Materia——— Latria adoranda eſt*. And in the *Roman Pontifical* it is ordered, that in the Proceſſion of the *Emperor* and a *Legate* of the *Pope*, the Legate's *Croſs* ſhall be carried on the

(a) Par. 3 Q. 2 A rt. 4. in Cor. Concluſio.

the Right Hand of the Emperor's *Sword*, becauſe (*a*) *Latria* is due to the *Croſs*.

And in the Adoration of the *Croſs* upon *Good-Friday* (which is the Principal Part of the Office for that Day) the *Croſs* being Veiled, is Diſcovered to the People by Degrees, firſt one *Arm* of the *Croſs*, then another, and at laſt the whole *Croſs* is Unveiled: And at each time the Prieſt ſays, *Ecce lignum Crucis, Behold the Wood of the Croſs:* And the People anſwer, *Adoremus, Let us Worſhip:* And then the *Prieſts* firſt, and afterwards the *People*, come upon their Knees and pay their *Adoration* to the *Croſs*. And remember that it is the Adoration of *Latria* which they give to it.

Now for *Images*, the ſame *Aquinas* before Mentioned tells us the Worſhip we pay them is (*b*) *Religionis Cultus*, a *Religious Worſhip*, and that it is not a different *Latria* which is given to *Chriſt* and to His *Images*, but ſays, (*c*) *That when Worſhip is paid to the Images of Chriſt, the Reaſon of the Latria is not Different, nor the Vertue of Religion.*

If then ther be but one *Latria*, and the ſame that is paid to *Chriſt* and to His *Images*, it will Juſtify what *James Naclantus*, Biſhop of *Clugium* Writes in his Expoſition of the

(*a*) *Quia debetur ei* (Cruci) *Latria.* (*b*) 2da 2dæ. Quæ 81. Art. 3. Reſp. ad 3. (*c*) Quod Imaginibus Chriſti exhibetur Cultus, non diverſificatur ratio Latriæ, nec Virtus Religionis.

Epiſtle to the *Romans*, chap. 1. (*a*) That the Faithful ought not only to Worſhip *before an Image* (as ſome perhaps out of Caution ſpeak) but to Worſhip the *Image* it ſelf, without any Scruple at all; and with the ſame Sort of Worſhip as the *Proto-type* or whom it Repreſents; and if that is to be Worſhipped with *Latria*, ſo its *Image* with *Latria*, if with *Dulia*, or *Hyperdulia*, ſo the *Image* is to be Worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip.

39. Ther is another ſtrange *Latria* paid to the *Præputium* of *Chriſt*, or the *Foreskin* was cut off at His *Circumciſion*. Your Doctors are at great Pains to know what is become of it. They might as well ask what is become of the *Parings* of His *Nails!* Whither will *Superſtition* run? They had it at *Antwerp*, but the Hereticks took it away. From thence it travelled by many Miracles to the Church of Saint *John Lateran* at *Rome*, and how it was thence Tranſlated to the Church of *Cornelius* and *Cyprian* at *Calcata*, about Twenty Miles from *Rome*, I have read the Account at large in a Book in *Folio*, Intitled, *De Baſilica & Pariarchio Lateranenſi, ad Alexand.*

(*a*) *Ergo non ſolum fatendum eſt, fideles in Eccleſia adorare coram Imagine* (*ut Nonnulli ad Cautelam forte loquuntur*) *ſed & Adorare Imaginem, ſine quo volueris ſcrupulo, quin & eo illam Venereantur Cultu, quo & Prototypon ejus; propter quod ſi Illud habet adorari Latria, & Illa Latria, ſi Dulia, vel Hyperdulia, & Illa pariter ejuſmodi Cultu adoranda eſt.* Venetiis.

lexand. VII. Pont. Max. auctore Cæsare Raspono ejusdem Basilicæ, Canonico. Romæ, 1656. p. 364, &c. And of the *Miraculous* Difference it shewed when it was touched by *Virgins* and by *Marryed Women !* See the *Devotions of the Roman Church*, p. 31. Where you will find other Authors Quoted, as *Bollandus*, *Act. Sanct. ad Jan.* 1. *de Præputio Christi*, and *Rivet. Apologia pro S. Maria Virgine: Lib.* 1. *c.* xvii. Cardinal *Tolet*, *in cap.* ii. *Luc. Annot.* 31. and *Salmeron*, *in Evang. Tom.* 3. *Tract.* 36. And that though it is still at *Calcata*, yet it is carry'd about at *Podium* with great Veneration upon the Feast of the *Ascension*. *Salmeron* in the place above Quoted tells out of the *Legend* of *Jacobus de Voragine*, that the Blessed *Virgin* gave this *Præpucium* first to *Mary Magdalen*, and that it was brought afterwards by an *Angel* to *Charles* the *Great* at *Aken*, and how after it came to be laid up in the *Lateran.* Whence these Verses,

Circumcisa Caro Christi, Sandalia Sacra,
Atque Umbilici viget hic Præcisio chara.

Put thus into English.

Christ's foreskin and blest Sandals are kept here,
And what was cut from off his Navel dear.

I suppose they meant the Cutting of His *Navel String*. And His *Sandals* (though it is not said that He wore any, He is always Painted *bare-foot)* will come in here too for

Latria

Latria, for the same Reason which *T. Aquinas* gives for *Latria* as due to the *Cross*, (*a*) *propter Membrorum Christi contactum*, because it *Touched* the *Body* of *Christ*. Then all his *Clothes* must come in for the same Reason, and the *Nails* and *Spear* that pierced Him. And why not the *Spittle* that was thrown in His Face? For the *Cross* was as much his *Enemy* (as far as *Wood* could be) as any of the other, or the *Spittle* it self. And I know not why the *Crucifiers* should not be Admitted too, though they touched Him with a Hostile Mind, as some have Sainted *Judas*, because he was an Instrument in our Redemption. For ther is no Stop in *Superstition* more than in other *Arts*.

But I must not forget my Friends the *School-Men* upon this Occasion, they Dispute, that the *Foreskin* being of the Intireness of the *Body*, it must have been Reunited to the *Body* of *Christ* upon His *Resurrection*, else that the Intire *Body* did not Arise. (*b*) *Suarez* therefore Concludes, that the *Body* of *Christ* at the *Resurrection* had a *Foreskin*, and has now in *Heaven*. But what then will he do with that *Foreskin*, which is shewed in the *Church* here below? He says, that the *Foreskin* belongs to the Intireness of the *Body*, *non Formaliter*, *sed Materialiter*, not *Formally*, but only *Materially*, and so the business is made up! But he adds, that

Innocent

(*a*) Par. 3. Qu. 2. Art. 4 in the *Conclusion*. (*b*) Suar. in 3. Par. Qu. 54. Act. 4. Disp. 47. §. 1.

Innocent iii. did call in Queſtion the Truth of this *Foreskin* upon Earth. Is it a Queſtion then? And do the People ſtill pay *Latria* to it? How comes this to be Suffered in the *Church?* In the *Church* that is *Infallible!*

But ſeveral Parcels of the *Blood* of *Chriſt* Shed upon the *Croſs* are likewiſe ſhewed, and (*a*) *Creſſy* quotes *Matth. Paris* for a Signal Teſtimony of it.

To this ſays (*b*) *Aquinas*, that *whatever belongs to the Nature of an Humane Body was wholly in the Body of Chriſt when He aroſe, as His Fleſh and Bones, and His Blood, and that intirely without any Diminution, otherwiſe* (ſays he) *it had not been a perfect Reſurrection.* And afterwards, (*c*) *that all the Blood* which flowed from the *Body* of *Chriſt*, Roſe again in His Body. *But as for that Blood* (ſays he) *which is preſerved in ſome Churches for Reliques, it did not flow from Chriſt's Side, but is ſaid to have flowed Miraculouſly from a certain Image of Chriſt that was pierced.* Yet the People pay *Latria* to it, Grounded wholly upon a *Legend!* And *Aquinas* gives no further Aſſurance of it, than *that it was ſaid.* Is not this Worſhipping in *Faith!* What *Blood* was that which came out of the *Image?* Was it *Chriſt*'s Blood? And how was it made ſo? Was it *Tranſ-ſubſtantiated*, or was it *Blood Materially*, though not *Formally?* Or had it only the *Colour* of *Blood*, the *Accidents* remaining without the *Subſtance? Vaſquez* comes pretty

(*a*) *Ch. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 13. (*b*) Part. 3. Qu. 54. Artic. 2. *Reſpondet dicendum.* (*c*) *Ibid. ad Tertium.*

pretty near this when he ſays, (*b*) *That no Portion of the Blood of Chriſt did remain on Earth under the Form of Blood, but only under its Colour*, amiſſa Forma Sanguinis, *having loſt the Form of Blood.*

L. What is this *Matter* and *Form* with which they keep ſuch a Stir?

G. They make *three* Conſtituting *Principles* in every thing, theſe they call *Materia, Forma, et Privatio.* That is, the *Matter* of which any thing is made; the *Form*, which is wholly unknown to us; and the *Want* of that *Form*, for you muſt know that we muſt *Want* a thing, before we *Have* it!

L. Trouble me no more with this *Jargon.* I pin not my Faith upon *Schoolmen.*

G. Yet this Article of your *Faith*, that is, *Tranſ-ſubſtantiation*, it nothing elſe, as I have (I hope) made it plain. And I will ſhew you another Inſtance wherein you follow them too, and are groſly Miſled by them, that is, the Diſtinction of *Concomitancy.*

L. What is that? I know it not.

(40.) *G.* I have before told of Several Injuries done to our Lord *Chriſt*, in *Adding* to His Commandments, and making to our ſelves *Means* of *Grace* which he has not Inſtituted. What I am to ſpeak of now is an Error on the other hand, that is of *Subſtracting* from

(*b*) In 3 par. Thomæ. Qu. 5. Artic. 2. Diſp. 36. c. 8. See alſo c. 4.

from his *Institutions*, and the *Means* of *Grace* which He has Appointed. I mean in taking away the *Cup* from the *Laity* in the Holy *Sacrament*, *Christ* Instituted the *Sacrament* of His *Body* and *Blood* as an Effectual *Means* of *Grace*, calling it the *Communion of His Body and Blood*. Particularly of the *Cup* it is said, (*a*) *The Cup of Blessing which we Bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ?* And that we all Partake of the *Cup*, according to several Manuscripts of your own *Vulgar Latin*, *Omnes de uno Pane, et de uno Calice participamus*. But that the *Laity* might not think themselves Deprived of this so Beneficial a *Means* of the Greatest *Grace*, the *Schools* have Invented a *Distinction* they call *Concomitancy*, which is, That in all *Flesh* there is some *Blood* goes along, or is *Concomitant* with it, so that whoever Eat the *Flesh* partake also of the *Blood*.

L. And is not that True?

G. Really, My Lord, I know not. But I am sure it is a *Nicety*. For *Flesh* may be so dryed that no *Blood* shall appear in it, and in a *Wafer* there can be None, without having Recourse to *Miracle*. I think it is making too Bold, to throw off the Institution of *Christ*, upon such Imaginations of our own; which Imply that there was no need of the Institution of the *Cup*, for if it be not Necessary

(*a*) 1 Cor. x. 16. 17.

ſary now, it was not ſo Then. But, my Lord, this *Sacrament* was Ordained, not only to Expreſs the *Death* of *Chriſt*, but alſo the *Manner* of it, that is, by the Shedding of His *Blood*, according to the *Bloody Types* of Him under the *Law*, as it is ſaid, (*a*) *without ſhedding of Blood there is no Remiſſion. It was therefore Neceſſary*, ſays the Apoſtle. But whatever *Blood* may be *Concomitant* in the *Fleſh*, yet here is no *ſhedding* of it Expreſſed in the *Wafer*.

L. But the *Cup* always goes along with the *Bread* in our Church, to Compleat the *Sacrifice*, though the *Prieſt* only who Officiates partakes of the *Cup*.

But when the *Hoſtia* is carry'd in Proceſſion, as upon *Corpus Chriſti* Day, or frequently to the Sick, there is no *Cup*, nor does the *Prieſt* himſelf *Communicate*. But however, if the People are to Partake of the *Sacrifice*, as it was under the Law, here they are Defrauded of Half of it! And they are as much Commanded to Partake of the *Cup* as of the *Bread*. And the Church may as well take away the *Bread*, and leave only the *Cup*, and ſay, that the *Fleſh* is Contained in the *Blood*, as well as the *Blood* in the *Fleſh*. Stange Power of *Church!* What *Inſtitution* of *God* can ſtand at this Rate? Suppoſe the *Jews* had neglected to pour out or Sprinkle

(*a*) Heb. ix. 22.

Sprinkle the *Blood* of their *Sacrifices* as Commanded, and said it was Sufficient that it was by *Concomitancy* in the *Flesh*, would this *Distinction* have served in that Case? And why not as well as in This?

It is observable that *Christ*, as foreseeing this taking away of the *Cup* from Many, added the Word *All* to the Drinking of the *Cup*, (*a*) *Drink ye All of it.* And it is said, *they All Drank of it*, It is not said so of the *Bread.*

L. There were None there but the *Apostles.* So that this Refers not to the *Laity.*

G. So you may say of the *Bread*, and Take That too from the *Laity* by the same Rule, and you take the *Cup* from the *Priests* who do not Officiate. But *Christ* said to the *People* to the *Laity*, (*b*) *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink His Blood, ye have no Life in you.* And this is Understood by all you of the *Church* of *Rome* as spoken of the *Sacrament.*

L. (*c*) *Bellarmin* says, That the *And* there *And drink*, is to be Understood as an *Or*, that is, Except ye either Eat *or Drink.*

G. That is to say, I may Understand all the *Ands* in the *Creed* to be *Ors*, and instead of I believe this, *And* this, *And* this, I may say, I believe this, *Or* this, *Or* this, so that if

I

(*a*) Matth. xxvi. 27. Mark xiv. 23. (*b*) Joh. vi. 53. (*c*) De Sacram. Eucharist. *l.* 4. c. 25.

I believe any *One Article*, it is Sufficient, though I believe never another. If you ſend your Servant to Market, and bid him bring *Beef* and *Mutton* and *Pork*, and he buys only *Beef*, and ſays, he Underſtood all your *Ands* for *Ors*. And ſo if you bid him bring ſo much *Meat* and ſo much *Drink*, and he brings only the *Meat*, for the ſame Reaſon —— Thus we may eaſily get over all the Commands of God, and give the Reverſe to (*a*) Saint *James*, that *he who offends in one Point is Guilty of all.* No, but *he who keeps one Point, keeps the whole Law.* This is *Bantering* inſtead of *Arguing.* And it ſhews a Cauſe to be very Deſtitute, when ſo Great a Man as *Bellarmin* could Content himſelf with giving ſuch an Anſwer.

And the Doctrine of *Concomitancy* will not do here, for if I eat a piece of *Fleſh*, ſuppoſe ſome *Blood* may be ſaid to be *Concomitant* there; yet I cannot be ſaid to *Drink*, where there is not one *Drop.* And the Threatning is, Except ye *Drink*, there is no Life in you.

(*b*) *If it be but a Man's Teſtament* (ſaith St. *Paul*) *yet if it be Confirmed, no Man Diſannulleth, or Addeth thereto.* This Holy *Sacrament* was the laſt *Teſtament* which *Chriſt* left to His *Church*, inſtituted the Evening before He entered upon His Sacred *Paſſion.* Therefore Pope *Gelaſius* had good Reaſon to call it

(*a*) Jam. ii. 10. (*b*) Gal. iii. 15.

it [a] *Sacrilege* in any who ſhould Mutilate this *Sacrament*, and Commanded that they who would not *Drink* of the *Cup*, ſhould be Denyed the Bread too.

L. This was only to Diſcover the *Manichians*, who would not Drink of the *Cup*, for other Reaſons than the Church of *Rome* had to take it from the *Laity*.

G. I never heard a tolerable Reaſon for it except becauſe they were *Laity!* But the Diſpute is not about the *Reaſons* for it, but the Thing it ſelf. To take away the *Cup* is to Mutilate the *Sacrament* : And that is *Sacrilege* by *Gelaſius* his Determination.

And this laſt *Teſtament* of our *Lord*, which was *Confirmed* by the *Practice* of the *Church* for *Fourteen Hundred* Years was Mutilated by the [b] Council of *Conſtans*, and the *Cup* taken from the *Laity*, with a *Non-Obſtante* as well to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, as the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church*? It was Declared no *Sacrilege* ; and the *Prieſt* was Excommunicated who ſhould Communicate the *Laity* under *Both Kinds*.

The Council of *Trent* [c] likewiſe puts in its *Caveat* to the *Inſtitution* in *Both Kinds*, and

M that

---

[a] apud *Gratian.* can. *Comperimus* de *Conſecr.* Diſt. 2. [b] licet Chriſtus — adminiſtraverit Sub utraque Specie Panis et vini — tamen hoc non Obſtante — Et Similiter quod licet in primitiva Eccleſia hujuſmodi Sacramentum recipiretur a fidelibus Sub utraque Specie; tamen — præcipimus Sub pœna Excommunicationis quod nullus Preſbyter communicet Populum Sub utraque Specie Panis et vini. Seſſ. 13 [c] Seſſ. 21. Can. 1, 2, 3.

that notwithſtanding the *Laity* muſt be Excluded from the *Cup*. And they make it a *Hereſie* to ſay, that *Whole Chriſt* is not under *Each Species*. Then the *Fleſh* is as much in the *Blood*, as the *Blood* in the *Fleſh*. And it is all one which *Species* we take. But ſince the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* were *Separated* at his *Death*, and He ordained them to be ſo *Separated* in the *Sacrament* of it, I ſee not how We can take away Either *Part*, upon the Account of their not being *Separated*.

L. Our *Catechiſm ad Parachos* gives *Six* Reaſons for taking away the *Cup*, (*a*) *Firſt*, The Danger of *Spilling* it. *Secondly*, Of its turning *Sour*. *Thirdly*, and *Fourthly*, For our *Health*, becauſe ſome could not bear the Taſte or Smell of *Wine*, without being Sick. *Fifthly*, That *Wine* was very Dear in ſome Places, And the *Sixth*, That we might believe *Whole Chriſt* to be under *each Species*. *Gerſon*'s Reaſon about the Long *Beards* of the *Laity*, before Mentioned, comes under the firſt of theſe Heads concerning *Spilling*.

G. Now, My Lord, I leave it to your ſelf, Whether theſe Reaſons be not very Childiſh, or are of Weight to Maim the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*?

Ther muſt no Compariſon be made betwixt the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, as to Preference, or which is moſt valuable: But our *Redemption*

(*a*) De Euchariſt. Sacrament. Sect. lxx.

tion is oftner Attributed in Holy Scripture to His *Blood* than to His *Body*. *We are Saved by His* BLOOD— *Propitiation through His* BLOOD *— by the Sprinkling of His* BLOOD — &c.

L. Ther is Mention made sometimes of the breaking of *Bread*, when ther is nothing said of the *Cup*; and this we make use of as an Argument that the *Cup* is not Necessary. This is mainly Insisted upon in our *Catechism*, the *Chap.* you just now Named, *Sect.* lxix. And *Joh.* vi. 51. is Quoted, *I am the Living Bread —— if any Man eat of this Bread —— And the Bread I will give is my Flesh.*

G. We take not this to be spoke of the *Sacrament*, but of *Faith* in *Christ*, here Expressed by *Eating*, that is, *Spiritually*, as Himself explains it, *ver.* 63. *It is the Spirit that Quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing: The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* But let it be taken of the *Sacrament*, as you do, you will find the *Blood* Joined with the *Flesh*, in the next Words, ver. 53. *Except ye Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink His Blood*— as before Quoted: And again, *ver.* 54. *Whoso Eateth My Flesh, and Drinketh My Blood*——— And *ver.* 55. *For My Flesh is Meat indeed, and My Blood is Drink indeed.* And *ver.* 56. *He that Eateth My Flesh, and Drinketh My Blood* ——— Is not the *Blood* here Named with the *Flesh?* But if it were not, ther are a Hundred Places, as I now observed, where the *Blood* of *Christ* is Named as *Cleansing*, as *Redeeming* us, *&c.* without

any Mention of His *Flesh* or *Body*. Are they therefore Excluded? This is such a sort of Reasoning, as if I invite you to *Eat* with me, you must have no *Drink* to your Dinner, because it was not Named. But if by *Eating* we commonly mean the Whole *Meal*, and *Drinking* is likewise Included, this *Criticism* upon the *Lord's Supper*, of calling it *Eating*, will Appear what it is, and not be thought Sufficient to Exclude the *Cup* in the *Sacrament*. And other Foundation you have none in *Scripture*. But if I once call it *Eating* the *Lord's Supper*, and several times call it both *Eating* and *Drinking*, will not the Latter explain the Former? Or will *Eating* exclude *Drinking*, though *Drinking* be expresly Named? To *Eat* the *Lord's Supper* is the only Phrase we use, I never heard any Body call it *Drinking* the *Supper*: And you may thence Prove that we have not the *Cup* in our *Sacrament*, as well as that the *Apostles* had it not, because it is said they *Eat Bread*, or broke *Bread*. But I have Over-Laboured this Point, because you lay so much Stress upon it.

I will now shew you another Restriction your *Church* has made upon the *Institutions* of *God*. As she has taken the *Cup* from the *Laity*, so has she taken another of your *Sacraments*, that is *Marriage* from the *Clergy*. I pass by the *Politick* Views and Advantages the Court of *Rome* has in this, as giving the *Pope* the more Absolute Command and making

king Him in Effect *Heir* of all the great Poſſeſſions of the *Clergy*, for the *Canon Law* obliges the Regular Biſhops not to Diſpoſe of their Eſtates by [a] *Will*, and the other *Clergy* not to be too Liberal of their *Alms* in their Sickneſs. And what they leave, the *Pope* diſpoſes of as Grand *Treaſurer* of the *Church*. But waving all this, I will Inſiſt now only upon what Relates to *Conſcience*. You reckon it a *Defilement* in your *Church* for a *Clergy-Man* to *Marry*. No great Complement to the Marryed State, which yet was *Inſtituted* of *God* in *Paradiſe* while Man was in his *Innocence*. And the Apoſtle ſays, [b] *Marriage is Honourable in All, and the Bed Undefiled.* And *forbidding to Marry* is Reckoned one of the [c] *Doctrines of Devils.* And directions are given how a *Biſhop* ſhould Govern his *Wife* and *Children*, [d] *for if a Man know not how to Rule his own Houſe, how ſhall he take Care of the Church of God?* Yet your Interpreters would have this *Wife* and this *Houſe* to be the *Church*! St. *Peter* was a *Married* Man, and forſook not his Wife after he was an *Apoſtle*, but [e] *led her about* with him *as other Apoſtles* did And that in the Primitive Church the *Clergy* did *Marry* is Plain from *Socrates* his *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* lib. i. cap. 11 and l. v. c. 22. The Vow of *Single Life* was not Impoſed upon the *Clergy* till *Pope Hildibrand.* See

[a] *Decretal.* Gregor. *lib.* 3 *de Teſtam. tit.* 26. *cap.* 7. 9. [b] Heb. xiii. 4. [c] i. Tim. iv. 3. [d] Chap. iii. 5. [e] 1. *Cor.* ix. 5.

Matth. Weſtmon. ad An. 1074. *Vincent.* Spec. Hiſt. l. 24. c. 45. *Antonin.* l. 16. c. 1. ſſ. 21. And it was *without Precedent* (ſays *Sigebert.* Chron. ad An. 1074.) *and, as many thought, out of an indiſcreet Zeal, contrary to the Opinion of the Holy Fathers.* But *Hildebrand*, was not obeyed in this in *England* for above a Hundred Years after, for our ancient Records ſay, (*a*) *All thoſe Decrees availed nothing, for the Prieſts by the King's Conſent ſtill had their Wives as formerly.* And *Gregory* the Great ſaid (*b*) *That it was lawful for ſuch of the Clergy as could not contain, to Marry.* And *Pius* the *Second* ſaid the ſame, (*c*) *That they may be allowed to Marry.* And your great Canoniſt *Panormittan* ſays, (*d*) *Ther is as great Reaſon to allow Prieſts to Marry now, as ever ther was to Reſtrain it.* Let St. *Bernard* bear Witneſs in his Time what Reaſon ther was for Allowing it, he ſays, (*e*) *Ther are many who cannot be hid for their Multitude, nor do ſeek to be Concealed through their Impudence, who, being Reſtrained from the Naptial Remedies, run into all Filthineſs.* And another ſays, (*f*) *That few in thoſe Days were free from Fornication.* And *Matthew Paris* tells that the *Pope* thought it almoſt a Miracle that a *Candedate* for a

(*a*) Hiſtor. *Petroburg.* An. 1127. ap. *Spelm.* T. 2. p. 36. (*b*) Reſponſ. ad Interrog. Secund. *Aug. Cantuar.* (*c*) *Pius* 2. in Geſt. Concil. *Baſil.* See alſo *Platin.* in his Life. p. 329. (*d*) De Clericis conjug. can. *cum olim.* (*e*) De Converſ. ad Cleric. cap. 29. (*f*) Gloſſ. ad *Gratian.* Diſt. 82. c. 5.

a Bishoprick was said to be a *Pure Virgin*. Whence the *Gloss. ad Gratian* in the Place just before Quoted, calls (*a*) *Fornication* but a *Venal* Sin. And it is Tollerated if not Allowed (*b*) However it was Reckoned a less Sin in a *Priest* than *Marriage*. For this Reason, *Deadly Sin* is added to *Fornication* in our *Litany*. But why was *Cælibacy* enjoined to the *Priests?* And why *Marriage* a greater Sin than *Fornication*? Because the First is a Breach of the Command of the *Church*, and the Latter of the Command of *God*! And the Difference of the *Punishment* of these in your *Church*, shews that she thinks so; for a *Priest* committing *Fornication* comes off for a Small *Penance*, whereas if he *Marries* he is *Degraded*. May we not then say to the *Church* of *Rome*, as *Christ* to the *Church* of the *Jews*, in a Parallel Case, (*c*) *Full well ye Reject the Commandment of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition.*

But if *Marriage* be such a *Defilement* as is Unworthy a *Priest*, how came you to make a *Sacrament* of it? I suppose you cannot mean less by a *Sacrament* than a *Means* of *Grace*, you have made many less things so, as is shewed before. And would you Deprive the *Clergy* of any *Means* of *Grace*? Or is it your Modesty to put them upon the Level with the *Laity* for Depriving them of the *Cup* in the *Sacrament* of *Christ*'s own *Institution.*

(*a*) *Decret.* P. *Alex.* l. 3. tit. 2. c. 3. *Gloss.* ad *Gratian.* dist. 82. c. 5
(*b*) Ibid. *Dist.* 34, *Can.* 7. *Costerus* Enchirid. de Cœlibat. c. 17.
(*c*) Mark. vii. 9.

Marriage is *Honourable* and *Undefiled* in *All*, says the *Apostle*. *No*, say you, *it is neither in a Priest*. He says. [*a*] *If Men cannot contain, let them Marry*; *for it is better to Marry than to Burn*, No, say you, it is better to *Burn* than to *Marry*. And this you must say, Unless you suppose that All the Many Thousands of your *Clergy*, and Many of them Young Men, are Every one of them Endowed with the Gift of *Continency*. Which would be a *Miracle*, if Experience did not Contradict it.

All Sober *Christians*, and even the *Heathen*, look upon Marriage as a Preserver and not a Breach of *Chastity*. St. *Peter* calls it a [*b*] *Chaste Conversation*. If it were not so, we may presume that *Christ* would not have Honoured it with His own *Presence*, and with His first *Miracle*, nor made it so frequently as He does, the *Type* and *Representation* of *Heaven*, and of His *Union* with the *Church*, calling Himself the *Bridegroom* and her His *Spouse*.

The Apostle says. [*c*] *To avoid Fornication, let every Man have his own Wife, and every Woman her own Husband*. No, say you, We Except all the *Clergy*, the *Friers* and the *Nuns*, whom we have put under *Vows* to the Contrary. And we will find other *Means* for them to obtain the *Grace* of *Continency*! Yes, and the World is full of the Effects of those *Means*! And know whether they are Better than those of *God's* Appointment!

It

[*a*] 1. Cor. vii. 9. [*b*] 1. Pet. iii. 2. [*c*] 1. Cor. vii. 2.

It is ſtrange that you who have ſo many *Means* of *Grace* of your own, ſhould not let thoſe very few which *Chriſt* has made ſtand as He left them!

(41.) But you Extend yours further than He did His, for He appointed None to be Uſed for thoſe in the other World: But you have *Offices* to deliver *Souls* out of *Purgatory*.

L. That ſeems a *Charitable* Office.

G. But it is a very *Dark* one. We have not a Word in *Scripture* of any ſuch State of the *Dead*, where *Souls* are put under Pains equal to thoſe of *Hell*, except for the Duration.

L. No *Unclean* thing can enter into *Heaven*.

G. Is not the *Blood* of Chriſt Sufficient to Cleans Us [*a*] *from all Unrighteouſneſs*.

L. Yes, ſurely. But though God pardons the *Guilt* of *Sin*, yet His *Juſtice* will *Puniſh* in ſome Degree.

G. Then the *Guilt* is not fully Forgiven.

L. Not ſo, but that we may be *Puniſhed* for it, as when *Afflictions*, *Diſeaſes*, &c. are ſent to us here upon Earth. God ſaid to *David*, [*b*] *I have put away thy Sin, but the Child ſhall Die*.

G. And the Reaſon is given in the next Words, *becauſe by this Deed thou haſt given great Occaſion to the Enemies of the Lord to Blaſpheme*, as if God did Countenance ſuch Wickedneſs; therefore *David* was Puniſhed ſo as his Enemies might perceive it. God puniſhes here either to

[*a*] 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. [*b*] 2 *Sam.* xii. 13.

to vindicate his own Honour before Men: Or for a Tryal of our *Faith*, as in the Case of *Job*, and to set forth such, as Examples to others: Or for a Proof and Confirmation of our *Religion*, as in the Case of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, *Confessors* and *Martyrs*: Or to *Correct* and *Recal* Obstinate *Sinners*, many have been *Reformed* by this Means: But all these Reasons respect this Life only. For you say not that *Souls* are made Better in *Purgatory*, for you suppose them to die in the Love of *God*, and to be in His Favour, before they go thither. And why then are they Punished, since they are not Purified by it?

L. To satisfy the *Vindicative* Justice of God.

G. That is satisfy'd before they are Forgiven and Received into the Favour of God. Unless you mean by *Vindicative* such a *Spite* and *Revenge* as is seen among the most Ignoble Part of Mankind, to say, *I will forgive, but I will at the same time be Revenged for what is past.* Which indeed is not Forgiveness, but a plain Unwillingness to Forgive. But a generous Forgiveness, upon a sincere Repentance, *Loves* and *Embraces*, and *Rejoices* to *Comfort* and heap *Favours*, like the *Father* of the Returning *Prodigal*. God says, He will not (*a*) *Remember* our Sins, that they shall not be *Mentioned unto us*, *in the Day when we turn from our Wickedness.* And how is that consistent with enduring the Pains of *Hell* for a Hundred, perhaps a Thousand Years

(*a*) Isai. xliii. 25. Jer. xxxi. 34. Ezek. xviii. 22. xxxiii. 12. 16.

Years for ought we know? And how do we know what Souls go to *Purgatory*? How long they Remain there? And which of them are Releaſed? Can *Prayers* then for the Releaſment of ſuch and ſuch be made in *Faith?* Otherwiſe they are *Sin*, by the *Apoſtle*'s Determination.

L. But the *Intention* is *Pious*.

G. So it is in all *Superſtition*, very *Pious*, and that is it which Deceives. But *God* has Required that our *Zeal* to *Him* ſhould be *(b) according to Knowledge*. And that we (*c*) *intrude not into things we have not ſeen*. We have not ſeen any *Revelation* for *Purgatory*, or the State of *Souls* there.

L. But we have the *Tradition* of the *Church* for it.

G. Ther are Good and Bad *Traditions*. And they are much oftner taken in the Bad Senſe throughout the *New Teſtament (d) Ye have made the Commandment of God of none Effect by your Tradition ——— Holding the Tradition of the Elders —— Laying aſide the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of Men ——— Ye Reject the Commandment of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition —— (e) Vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men ——— Your vain Converſation received by Tradition from your Fathers*, &c.

Yet ther is a *Tradition* which (for the Evidence of it) we are willing to admit, that is, according to the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, *Quod*

(*b*) Rom. x. 2. (*c*) Col. ii. 18. (*d*) Matth. xv. 6. Mar. vii. 3. 8, 9. (*e*) Col. ii. 8. 1 Pet. i. 18.

Quod ſemper ubiqui, & ab omnibus, That which was always received, every where. and by all. And we are willing to join Iſſue with you upon this *Tradition* as to *Purgatory*. This is *Univerſal Tradition*. And you would not deſire we ſhould be concluded by any *Particular Tradition* of this or that *Church* or *Place*, for you know ther are many Deceits in ſuch.

But *Veron* in his *Rule of Faith* (a Book much Applauded in *France*, and put into *Engliſh* for the Uſe of the *Roman Catholicks* here) ſets out in the Beginning with a Definition of the *Rule of Faith*, of which he makes the firſt Requiſit to be for any Article of *Faith*, that it be clearly *Revealed* in *Scripture* (and by no pretended *Revelation* ſince to any whatſoever) in expreſs Words, or thence to be deduced by *Neceſſary Conſequence*. Which when made appear as to *Purgatory* (or any other of the *Doctrines* in Diſpute) we ſhall readily allow it. And till then, we cannot be Arraigned of *Hereſy* for not Profeſſing to Believe it.

This *intruding into things we have not ſeen*, proceeds, as the *Apoſtle* obſerves, from a [a] *Fleſhly Mind*, Meaſuring *Spiritual* things by *Carnal*. We ſee it takes time to Purge the *Fleſh* of Diſeaſes and Defilements it has contracted and it takes a great deal of Filing and Scrubbing to Cleanſe Iron that has been long *Ruſted*. Hence we conjecture the ſame as to *Souls* departed, that they muſt be Purged by *Fire*. But the

[a] Coll. ii. 18.

the Work of *God* upon the *Soul*, when He grants true *Faith* and *Repentance* Operates far otherwiſe, it Effects the Cure of all at once, as with thoſe who looked upon the *Brazen Serpent*. Our *Saviour* Himſelf (*b*) makes the Compariſon. And he (*c*) gave us an Example of it in the *Thief* upon the *Croſs*, who was tranſlated to *Paradice* the ſame Day he Died. And yet he had been a grievous Sinner, and Suffered juſtly for his Offences; his Repentance was Late, and he had made no Reſtitution; yet he did no *Penance* in *Purgatory*.

L. That was an Extraordinary Caſe, his *Faith* muſt be very Strong to be Converted upon the *Croſs*.

G. That is more than we know, whether he might not have been Converted before. But however, it ſhews ther is no Neceſſity for *Purgatory*, even for very great Offenders.

L. No doubt *God* may Excuſe whom He pleaſes.

G. How then do we know Whom He excuſes, and whom not? And how can we Pray in *Faith*, that is, without *Sin*, to Deliver ſuch a particular *Perſon* from thence?

But if there be no *Neceſſity* for it, as you have Granted in the Caſe of the *Thief*, how is it to be Imagined that *God* ſhould keep ſo many Thouſand *Souls*, for many Years or Ages, in the moſt Extreme *Torments*, when there was no *Neceſſity* for it? And if the *Pope* has Power to Releaſe

(*b*) Joh. iii. 14, 15. (*c*) Luk. xxiii. 43.

Releaſe out of *Purgatory*, he muſt be a very Cruel *Father* who keeps one *Soul* there an Hour longer.

L. We ſee the *Church* impoſing *Penance* and yet Excuſing ſome, Shortning the Time more than to others.

G. The *Church* knows not the *Heart*, and muſt Judge by *Signs*, which yet Secure not from *Hypocriſie*. But this is all Foreign as to *God*, who ſearcheth the *Heart*, and knoweth all that is in Man. And tho' our *Phyſick* of *Diſciplin* works by Degrees, and the Iſſue is uncertain; yet *God* never *Cures* Imperfectly, *Chriſt* never *Half-Healed* any Man. And ſo it is when He pardons Sinners, (*a*) *Thy Sins are forgiven thee.* It is not ſaid, *ſhall be* forgiven, or when thou haſt performed ſuch and ſuch *Penance*, but the *Forgiveneſs* of his *Sins* was as Immediately wrought as the *Cure* of his *Body*. And *God* gives us all the Aſſurances that can be, in the Strongeſt Expreſſions, of our *Sins* being Abſolutely and Totally *Forgiven*, as being (*b*) *all Blotted out, all caſt into the Depths of the Sea.* Never to be *Remembred* or *Mentioned unto us* any more, as before quoted. *I will Heal* (*c*) *their Backſliding, I will Love them freely.* He is *Ready to Forgive.* He *Waiteth to have Mercy.* He *earneſtly Remembreth*, His *Bowels are troubled* for Sinners that they may Repent, and *in the Day they turn from their Wickedneſs*, He *Forgiveth.*

(*a*) Luk. v. 20. (*b*) Pſal. li. 9. Iſai. xliv. 22. Col. ii. 14. Mic. vii. 19. (*c*) Hoſ. xiv. 4 Pſal. lxxxvi. 5. Iſai. xxx. 18. Jer. xxxi. 20. Ezek. xxxiii. 12. Lam. iii. 33.

eth. For He doth not afflict willingly, nor Grieve the Children of Men. It is for their Repentance and Reformation, but that Conſideration is not in *Purgatory.*

But how will the poor Souls there (if any are there) be Deluded, if the Stock of *Supererogation* ſhould fail them, that is, the *Merits* of *Saints* for their *good Works* which they have done, over and above their *Duty*, and what they were obliged to for their own *Salvation*, and therefore are Applyed to others who had come ſhort of their Duty, to ſupply their Deficiencies; which is the Fund provided for the Diſcharge of the Priſoners in *Purgatory*? And this is Diſpenſed by the *Pope* to whom he thinks fit, as being the Grand *Treaſurer* of the *Church*, and Conſequently of theſe Super-Abundant *Merits* of the *Saints*. But we want a *Text* where St. *Peter* was Conſtituted ſuch a *Treaſurer*. Or that there is or can be any ſuch *Treaſury*. For can a Creature *Merit* at the Hands of God, for ever ſo Great Endowments beſtowed upon him? Is it a *Merit* to *Receive* great Gifts? And if we Employ them to the beſt Advantage, is it more than is our *Duty* to do? And we are ſtill (*a*) *unprofitable Servants*, as *Chriſt* Himſelf has told us. But was there ever a Man (*Chriſt* only excepted) who did all his *Duty*? Are not all *Sinners*? And if their *Repentance* entitle them to *Pardon*, yet this is far from *Merit*. My doing my Duty

(*a*) Luk. xvii. 10.

Duty to Day, makes no Amends for my having Neglected it Yesterday. We find the greateſt *Saints* applying to the *Mercy* of *God*, and not pleading their own *Merits*. *Jacob* ſaid, [*a*] *I am not worthy of the leaſt of all thy Mercies*, And *Job* who had [*b*] *None like him in the Earth, a Perfect and Upright Man*, &c. ſaid, *I abhor my ſelf, and Repent in Duſt and Aſhes*. And *Daniel*, the Man [*c*] *greatly Beloved*, Confeſſed his own Sins, as well as the Sins of the People. And St. *Paul* called himſelf the [*d*] *Chief* of *Sinners* not worthy to be an *Apoſtle*, &c. And if the *Saints* own no *Merit* in themſelves, then ſurely they will Diſown all thoſe who Apply to their *Merits*; and, as I ſaid before concerning the *Worſhip* and *Invocation* of them, by which you hope to Gain them to be *Interceſſors* for you, they muſt become your *Accuſers*, by their Denial of their Acceptance of ſuch *Worſhip* from you, which if they ſhould Accept, it would make them *Evil Spirits*, as I have Quoted out of St. *Auguſtine*.

But what *Creature* dare plead *Purity* before *God?* [*f*] *Behold He chargeth His Angels with Folly; and he putteth no Truſt in His Saints; yea the Heavens are not Clean in His Sight. How much more Abominable and Filthy is Man, who drinketh Iniquity like Water?* And *what is Man that he ſhould be Clean? And he that is born of a Woman, that he ſhould be Righteous?* And if

All

[*a*] Gen. xxxii. 10. [*b*] Job. i. 8. xlii. 6. [*c*] Dan. ix. 20. 23. [*d*] 1. Tim. i. 15. 1. Cor. xv. 9. [*e*] Job. iv. 18. xv. 15.

All [a] *our Righteousneſs are as filthy Rags.* If there be [b] *Iniquity* in our *Holy* things, in the *Holy Sanctuary* and *Alter*. What then is Clean? [c] *And if the Righteous* themſelves ſhall *ſcarcely be ſaved*, What *Merits* have they to ſpare for others? Eſpecially when they are not ſaved even by their own Works. [d] *For by Grace ye are ſaved—— not of Works, leſt any Man ſhould Boaſt.* Can any Man then Boaſt of his *Works*, as not only ſufficient for his own Salvation, but over and above as *Meritorious* to be Applyed to others, and to Deliver Souls out of *Purgatory?* No, my Lord, the *Saints* make no ſuch Boaſts. And will Diſown all thoſe who make them in their Name. For they know that [e] *All have Sinned, and come ſhort of the Glory of God; being Juſtified freely by His Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt—— Where is boaſting then? It is Excluded. By what Law; Of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* And every Man is Saved by his own *Faith*, not by the *Faith* of others. And God will [f] *Reward every Man according to his Works*, not the *Works* of others. Miſerable then is the Condition of thoſe Souls ſuppoſed to be in *Purgatory* if they muſt not thence be Delivered but by Works of *Supererogation*, when no Man can be ſaved by his own Works, for *We are ſaved*---[g] *Not according to our Works, but according to the Grace of God in Chriſt Jeſus.*

[a] Iſai. lxiv. 6. [b] Exod. xxviii. 38. Lev. xvi. 33. [c] 1 Pet. iv. 18. [d] Eph. ii. 8. 9. [e] Rom. iii. 23, 24, 27. [f] Matth. xvi. 27. [g] ii. Tim. i. 9.

[a] *Not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to His Mercy He ſaved us—— through* Jeſus Chriſt *our Saviour.* We have no other *Saviour*, nor can be Saved by the *Merits* of any other. None other can *Merit* from *God.* The greateſt *Saint* that ever was is ſaved only by *Mercy*, and the Forgiveneſs of his *Sins.* Let us therefore not Truſt to the *Supererogated* Works of thoſe, which were not able to ſave Themſelves. [b] *That every Mouth may be ſtopped, and all the World may become Guilty before God.* [c] *For in His Sight ſhall no Man living be Juſtified. Ther is none Righteous, no not one.*

But beſides all this, there are Degrees of Glory in Heaven. So that if any could *Supererogate*, yet has he nothing to ſpare to others, becauſe, he has Received the full of his Reward himſelf. This ſhuts up *Purgatory* for Ever, by Exhauſting every Penny of that *Treaſury* reſerved for Redemption from thence.

And the Expectation of having thoſe many Sins called *Venial* with you Remitted after Death, does naturally make Men more Careleſs in their Life. And truſting to the *Merits* of others, will Abate their Diligence in being nicely Righteous themſelves.

L. But we find ſome Inſtances among the *Fathers* of *Prayers* for *the Dead.*

G. Some few among the *Fathers* you may, but none in *Scripture.* But what were theſe *Prayers*

---

[a] Tit. ii. 5, 6. [b] Rom. iii. 19. [c] Pſal. cxiv. 2.

Prayers? They were for *Peace* and *Reſt* to thoſe who were Suppoſed to be in *Peace*, yet might receive Increaſe of Happineſs even before the *Reſurrection*, as ſome ſuppoſe *Heaven* it ſelf to Conſiſt in an Eternal *Increaſe of Bliſs*. But without this, We may Pray for Continuance of *Peace* to thoſe who are in *Peace*, though we know it will ſurely be; as when we Pray *Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done.* We know it muſt be, but this ſhews our Aſſent and Wiſhes for it. And in this Senſe we alſo Pray for the *Dead*, That it would pleaſe God, [a] *ſhortly to Accompliſh the Number of His Elect and to haſten His Kingdom, that we, with all thoſe that are Departed in the true Faith of His Holy Name, may have our perfect Conſummation and Bliſs, both in Body and Soul, in His Eternal and Everlaſting Glory.* And we Bleſs Him, [b] *for all His Servants Departed this Life, in His Faith and Fear; beſeeching Him to give us Grace ſo to follow their good Examples, that, with them, we may be Partakers of His Heavenly Kingdom.* So that we Pray for Them as well as for our Selves, that we *with them*, may be Partakers, *&c.* But neither theſe Prayers of ours nor thoſe of the Ancients, have any Relation to *Purgatory* or delivering Souls from thence, as from a Place of *Torment*.

Some of the Ancients had an Imagination of a Purging *Fire* through which Sinners were

[a] *Order for the Burial of the Dead.* [b] *Communion Office.* Prayer for the *Church Militant.*

to pass, but they meant the General *Conflagration* at the Last Day. Which comes not at all to your Notion of *Purgatory*. But I would not trouble your Lordship with Excursions, or Debating every Branch of these Disputes, only give you a Summary View of the Heart of the Cause, and to see where the Matter Pinches. And indeed, my Lord, my Endeavour with your Lordship is rather to State the Case, than to Argue upon it; for *Truth* needs no more than to be fairly Shewn, it Convinces of it self; and Best when it is *Naked*, without the *Fucus* of *Philosopky* and *Distinctions* which are Endless.

These will put a Colour upon *Implicit* it self, and make you believe you Understand what you know nothing of! My Lord, give me Leave to say, your whole Religion is *Implicit*, not only as to the particular *Points* we have Discoursed, but your whole *Publick Worship* is such, while your *Prayers* are in a *Language* not Understood by the *People*. How then can they [a] *Pray with the Understanding*, as the *Apostle* requires? And *how can they say Amen, seeing they Understand not what is said*?

L. They have *Prayers* of their own, and carry little *Prayer Books* with them which they Read while the *Priest* is Repeating the *Publick Offices*.

G. But this is not Joining with the *Priest*, and they cannot say *Amen* to his Prayers.

What

[a] 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16.

What then have they to do at *Church*? This is not *Communion*. It is purely *Implicit*, and nothing elſe but *Opus Operatum*. It is an *Invention* without *Precedent*, for it never Entered into the Head of *Man* or *Church* ſince the Creation except only the *Church* of *Rome*. And of which the Apoſtle gives this Character, [a] *Will they not ſay ye are Mad?*

What is it ſhort of this which *Suarez* ſays? [b] *That it is not neceſſary to Prayer that the Perſon Praying ſhould think of what he ſpeaks.* This is *Opus Operatum*, with a Witneſs! And a *Parrat* may be taught thus to *Pray*. And how do they *Pray* with the *Prieſt*, who are talking of *Buſineſs*, or Chatting of *News* while he is Offering up their *Prayers* to *God*, in a *Language* of which they Underſtand not one Word, and therefore cannot give Attention to it? And theſe are the Greateſt Number, *viz.* of the Common People who cannot Read, and ſo cannot carry Private *Books* of *Devotion* with them; though if they did, it would not be *Joining* with the *Prieſt*, nor could theſe be called *Common Prayer*, which are Offered up with *One Accord*, purſuant to St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Prayer, with which our daily *Publick Prayers* do Conclude.

And now, My Lord, upon the Whole, if the Advantage does not ſeem to your Lordſhip to lye on our ſide, in all the Particulars

[a] *Ibid.* ver. 23. [b] *De Orat* lib. 3. c. 14. and *Salmeron.* &c.

before Mentioned; yet can you have any Doubt of the Safety of your Soul in our way? Since all our Danger is, Omitting some things that might be *Profitable*, but cannot be called *Necessary*: Whereas if the Error lyes on your Side, you are Involved in Manifold *Superstitions*, and of Adding to and Substracting from the *Word of God*.

L. I confess nothing sticks with me but the *Church*, of being in the *Church*, and preserving the *Unity* of the *Church*.

G. Therefore I began with that, and desire to Close with it, for it is the *Jugulum Causæ*.

I have shewed wherein the *Unity* of the *Church* did Consist, according to the Institution of *Christ*, and as the Primitive *Fathers* Understood it, that is, an *Unity* in *Faith*, and in the Mutual *Love* and good *Correspondence* of *Christians* and *Sister Churches*; though one *Sister* must be *Elder* than another, and *Rome* was not the *Eldest*: One might be *Greater* or more *Powerful* than another, and this did vary, according to the Course of this World: *Jerusalem* was at first the only *Church* of *Christ*, than *Antioch* became the Greatest of the *Gentle Church*, where *Christianity* first Received its Name, afterwards *Rome* became the Greatest, from being the *Seat* of the *Roman Empire*, but *Constantinople* was the first Assumed an *Universal Supremacy*, when she became the *Head* of that *Empire*. And this was it which Broke the *Unity* of the *Sister Churches*, and filled them with *Schisms* and *Divisions* among themselves

themſelves, one Affecting *Superiority* over another, and Encreaſing it to an Abſolute *Temporal* Dominion. Of which *Chriſt* ſaid to the Apoſtles, [a] *It ſhall not be ſo among you.* And again, (for they Contended more than once for the *Superiority)* after the Inſtitution and Celebration of the Holy *Euchariſt*, juſt as He was going to Enter upon His Sacred *Paſſion*, and to take His final Leave of them, this Diſpute aroſe again, *Which of them ſhould be the Greateſt*, and that was the Time to Determine it if Ever, but He again Checked their Ambition, and the Error of their Thought, as if the *Church* were to be Governed with *Temporal* Sway and Authority, like the Grandeur of Secular *Princes*, but told them plainly [b] *Ye ſhall not be ſo.*

And in His farewel Sermon, continued upon the ſame Occaſion, and at the ſame Time, He inſiſted much upon their *Unity*, and Placed it, not upon the *Superiority* of any One of them over the Others, but in their Mutual *Love* and good Agreement with Each other, in their *Union* with *God* and with *Himſelf*, upon which He wonderfully Expatiates in moſt Exalted Words, which take up four whole Chapters in S. *John*, and begins, (c) *Little Children, yet a little while I am with you—— A new Commandment I give unto you, That ye Love one another— By this ſhall all Men know that ye are My Diſciples, if ye have Love one to another.* This is the *Unity* of which *Chriſt*

 ſpeaks

[a] Matth. xx. 25. [b] Luk. xxii. 26. [c] Joh. xiii. 33.

ſpeaks in theſe His laſt Words to the *Apoſtles*. He ſaid, [a] *My Kingdom is not of this World: If my Kingdom were of this World, then would my Servants Fight* —— But he that calls himſelf *Servus Servorum*, the *Servant* of His *Servants*, has *Fought*, and Raiſed bloody *Wars* in Defence, as he ſays, of this his Maſter's *Kingdom!* And he will have the *Government* of it juſt the ſame as of other *Kingdoms* of the World, and its *Unity* to Conſiſt, like theirs, in being under one Abſolute and Deſpotick *Head* or *King*. But no *Kingdom* of the Earth will Content him. He will be *Univerſal Monarch* of the whole World. And why? Becauſe *Chriſt* is the *Head* of all *Churches*, and therefore muſt have an *Univerſal Vicar*. And from the ſame Parity of Reaſon, becauſe [b] *God is the King of all the Earth*, therefore He muſt have an *Univerſal Vicar* in *Temporals*. And if *England*, *France*, *Spain*, &c. ſhould Contend which of them were this *Univerſal Vicar*, would not the Anſwer be Eaſy? That the Conteſt was fooliſh and vain, for though one *Kingdom* might be *Greater* or more *Ancient* than another, yet was it ſtill but a *Part* of the *Whole*, that is of the *World*. And that *God* had Appointed no ſuch *Univerſal Vicar*. The Caſe is exactly Parallel, unleſs it can be ſhewed, that *Chriſt* has Appointed ſuch an *Univerſal Vicar* in the *Church*; And told us Plainly who it is, that we may obey

[a] Joh. xviii. 36. [b] Pſal. xlvii. 7.

obey Him. Which when done, we will own our ſelves *Hereticks*, *Schiſmaticks*, and what you will, till we Return and Pay our Obedience to Him.

But on the other hand, if *Chriſt* has Appointed no ſuch *Univerſal Vicar*, then are you under a Mortal *Miſtake* concerning the *Unity* of the *Church*, which you Place wholly upon our being *United* in Obedience to ſuch an One. And your *Church* is the Great Breaker of Eccleſiaſtical *Unity*, while ſhe will bear no *Siſter Church*, but will be the *Mother* of all *Churches*, though ſhe be not the *Eldeſt*.

This, My Lord, is the very *Heart* of the *Cauſe*. And we are verily Perſuaded that ther is not the leaſt Ground for this *Univerſal Supremacy*, either in the Holy *Scriptures*, or in *Antiquity*, or in the *Reaſon* of the Thing, or in *Fact*, ſince the firſt Foundation of *Chriſtianity* to this Day, or that it was ever Acknowledged, or is Now, by the Majority of Chriſtian *Churches*. And yet this is the Foundation of all the Diſputes betwixt your *Church* and ours, and all other *Chriſtian Churches*.

Chriſt forſaw the Conſequences of truſting an *Univerſal Supremacy* in the Hands of *Fallible* Men. An *Univerſal King* muſt Ruin the World, for *Appeals* to Him muſt lye in all Cauſes from all the Parts of the Earth, and Men muſt Attend with their *Witneſſes*, and all other things Neceſſary to carry on a *Law Suit*. The *Oppreſſion* of this (beyond all other *Tyrannies*) may Appear by the *Ap-*

peals

peals to *Rome*, in the times of *Popery*, no further than from *England* thither, where *Cauſes* laſted from Age to Age, loudly Complained of in thoſe Times and Attempts made to Reſtrain it in ſome Meaſure by ſeveral of our *Acts of Parliament*, but not to Purpoſe till the *Reformation*: And this indeed made the *Reformation* even *Neceſſary*, for the Preſervation of the *People*, as well *Laity* as *Clergy*, who Groaned under this *Burden* which neither they nor their Fathers were able to Bear. Dr. *Parker* late Lord Biſhop of *Oxford*, in his Excellent *Diſcourſe ſent to the late King James*, when he was *Arch Deacon* of *Canterbury*, Printed here in the Year 1690, ſays upon this Head, p. 29. *I my ſelf enjoy a ſmall Office in this Church, wherein my Predeceſſors had a Suit for a Privilege belonging to it, hanging in the Court of Rome for ſome Hundreds of Years, till the very Time of the Diſſolution of the Pope's Power.* Hence we may Judge how it would be with the *Churches*, in the *Indies* and the moſt Remote Places in the *World*, if it were All under his Power, as he Pretends! But the Good *Providence* of *God* has not Suffered it to Extend to Half of the Chriſtian *Churhces* (as before is ſaid) and His *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs* has ſtill Preſerved the *Major* Part true *Proteſtants* againſt this *Uſurpation*; beſides the great Number He has Reſcued from it, and has never Suffered any of theſe Reformed *Churches* or *Nations* to Return to it again, as before has been Obſerved: And beſides that the *Principle* it ſelf,

ſelf, and the *Pretenſions* of the *Pope* to this *Univerſal* and *Unlimited Supremacy* are Beat down and Exploded by the *Gallican Church*, and others the moſt Learned who ſtill Remain in his *Communion* whether he will or not, and though he *Excommunicates* them afreſh every Year!

And now, My Lord, I cannot but think it made Plain to a Demonſtration, that this *Univerſal Supremacy* is a thing Impracticable; and that if it could be in *Fact*, it would be the greateſt Ruin and Oppreſſion to the *Church* that is Poſſible. And if an *Univerſal King* would be Inſupportable to the *World*. how much more an *Univerſal Biſhop* to the *Church*? For he muſt have an Abſolute *Dominion* over our *Faith*, over the Holy *Scriptures*, and over the *Church*, which muſt ſuddenly Fall (as I before quoted *Gregory* the Great) if it comes to depend upon One. And that whoever ſhould Aſſume it, would be as he Propheſied a *Lucifer*, and the fore-runner of *Anti-Chriſt*. And can he be leſs, if he has *Uſurped* ſo vaſt an *Authority*, and *Infallibity* it ſelf to ſupport it.

I ſaid before, that an *Univerſal King* would make all *Wars* to be *Rebellion*, and ſo Incurable but by utter Deſtruction. Thus it is with the *Univerſal Biſhop*, Oppoſing his *Supremacy* is *Hereſy*, *Schiſm*, and *Excommunication*: And is the only *Article* in your *Creed* to be Believed *Explicitly*, as for the others, *Implicit* will do for them all! That is, it is no Matter whether

whether you Believe them or not, so the *Sovereignty* of the *Universal Bishop* be Maintained Inviolably!

But though every *King* is not a *Bishop*, yet the *Universal Bishop* must likewise be *Universal King*, with Power to *Depose* all *Kings* at his Pleasure. Of this I have spoke at large.

And though nothing need be said to this Almighty *Claim*, both in *Spirituals* and *Temporals*, but to put you to the Proof of its *Institution* by *Christ*, who Disowned all *Civil* Power *Himself*, and said, [a] *Who made me a Judge?* Yet I have gone further, (that this Cause might be put out of all Dispute) and shewed the Inconsistency of your own *Claim* to be the only *Catholick Church*, and to Enjoy the true *Unity* of it, in these Particulars following.

1. Ther never was a *Church* called *Catholick*, in the Sense of *Rome*, that is, which was owned by all other *Churches* as their *Head*, at least since that of *Jerusalem*.

L. But we admit none other to be *Christian Churches* but those who do own it.

G. That is to say, it must do one way or other, if the *Mountain* will not come to *Mahomet*, *Mahomet* must go to the *Mountain*. It is like the Bed *Procrustes* made to fit all Persons, by *Stretching* those to the *Length* of it who were *Shorter*, and *Cutting* off Part of those who were *Longer* than it. Thus the *Church* of *Rome* becomes *Universal*, by *Stretching* her *Communion* to those who

[a] Luk. xii. 14.

who ſtand *Excommunicated* by her, and *Cutting* of all *Churches* who will not own her *Supremacy*. And thus ſhe muſt be ſtill *Univerſal*, though ſhe had no more left than the *Dioceſs* of *Rome*; or ſuppoſe none but the *Pope* himſelf, than He would be the *Univerſal Church*! And it may well be Preſerved in a *Pope*, if it may in one *Laick*, a *Woman* or an *Infant*.

2. And then ther will be perfect *Unity*. And I am afraid not till then; for perfect *Unity* is not only in outward *Communion*, that is, being within the ſame *Walls* together: Or in Subſcribing a *Formula* of *Articles* of *Faith*, half of which muſt be believed *Implicitly*: But an *Unity* likewiſe in *Saving* or *Damning Principles* and *Practices*, in *Love* and *Charity*, for which Chiefly we ſhall be [*a*] Judged at the Laſt Day. If theſe are wanting, the *Unity* will be very *Imperfect*, and ſtand us in little Stead.

3. Ther ought to be alſo an *Unity* where to place your *Infallibility* (elſe it is None) of which I have given four *Schemes*, each one Contradictory to all the Reſt, and not yet Determined by your *Church*. And this is an *Unity* in *Faith* among you. It is the *Foundation* upon which your *Church* is Built.

4. There muſt be an *Unity* and full Agreement which of the *Articles* of your *Creed* are to be believed *Explicitly*, and which *Implicitly*, that is indeed which are Neceſſary to be Believed, and which not? Without this, your *Faith* is wholly Uncertain. And

[*a*] Matth. xxv. 31. &c.

And till these things be adjusted, you cannot be said to have *Unity* even in *Faith*.

And if you have not *Unity* in *Faith*; nor in those *Principles* and *Practices* which are no less Necessary to *Salvation*; Nor in that *Love* and *Charity* which *Christ* has made the *Characteristick* of *Christians*, and without which [a] no Man can know who are His *Disciples*: But instead of that, if you have Envyings and Strife among you, among your several Religious *Orders*, betwixt National and National *Church*, concerning the *Infallibility* and *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, and of his Power to Depose *Princes*, upon which the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *World*, and our eternal *Salvation* does depend; and in short, if you have no *Unity* concerning your *Rule* of *Faith* it self, or of your *Practice*, what will the *Unity* of Outward *Communion* do, upon which you lay the whole Stress? It will not so much as Denominate you *Christians*, far less to be the only *Christians* in the World, or the *Catholick Church*.

It is true that *Unity* in *Communion* is a Desirable thing, and ought to be preserved among all *Churches*; but it is still a Part only of the *Unity* of the *Church*, as I have shewed. And that the *Supremacy* of the *Pope* has been the Chief Cause of the Breach of it. But yet it is not such a Breach as Destroys all other Parts of the *Unity* of the *Church*, their *Unity* in One *Lord*, One *Faith*, One *Baptism*. It may be called an Essential Part of the *Perfect Unity* of the *Church*, but,

[a] Joh. xiii. 35.

but, Alas! What is *Perfect* upon Earth? And it is not ſo *Eſſential* as that the Want of it ſhould quite *Un-Church*; ſo that if ther were not a *Church* upon Earth that did *Communicate* with another, yet they would not all Ceaſe, for that Cauſe only, to be *Chriſtian Churches*. As if all the *Nations* in the World were at *War* with each other, yet it would be the ſame *World* ſtill, and *God*'s One *Kingdom* upon Earth, and each *Nation* a Part of it.

L. But the *Unity* of the *Church* ought to be more than that of the *Temporal* World.

G. True. But we ſay, *Magis & Minus non variant Speciem*, that *More* or *Leſs* alter not the *Kind*, as a greater or leſs Quantity of *Gold* (for Example) alters not the *Species* of the *Gold*. So *Unity* is *Unity*, be it more or leſs. And ther is an *Unity* among all *Nations*, even though at *War*, the *Unity* of *Blood*, and of *Reaſon*, being all made of one *Blood*, and all endowed with the ſame *Reaſon*, which makes them all Agree in ſome Common *Principles*, and all Appeal to *Reaſon* in the *Juſtice* of their *Wars*. But this *Unity* is not *Perfect* while they Bite and Devour one another.

And though the *Unity* is Greater, where *Revelation* is added to *Reaſon*, and Men agree in the ſame *Religion* which we call the *Church*; yet this *Unity* is not *Perfect*, while ther are *Diſputes*, *Animoſities*, and various *Opinions* about it. And in the Church of *Rome* her ſelf ther are great Variety of *Opinions* among thoſe

thoſe of her *Communion*, and *Animoſities* thereupon Raiſed, ſo Great as gives her much Trouble to Compoſe, and ſometimes finds it paſt her Power, and is forced to Bear what ſhe cannot Remedy.

L. What do you mean then by the *Holy Catholick Church* in the *Creed?*

G. This *Article* was but late put into the *Creed*, on occaſion of Diviſions which aroſe among the *Churches*, to mind them that they were all *Members* of the ſame *Body*, of the one *Catholick Church.* The next *Article* Explains this, and may be called a Part of it, *viz. The Communion of Saints*, and theſe are only the *Elect*, who are not viſible upon *Earth*; and therefore muſt be Referred to *Heaven*, where only is the true *Communion of Saints*, without Mixture of the *Reprobate*, who are not *Members* of *Chriſt*, and but in Appearance of the *Church.* We have no *Unity* of the *Spirit* with theſe, and Conſequently are not one *Body* with them: [a] For what *Fellowſhip* hath *Righteouſneſs* with *Unrighteouſneſs?* And what *Communion* hath *Light* with *Darkneſs?* And what *Concord* hath *Chriſt* with *Belial?* And what *Unity* hath that *Church* where theſe are mixed together? Therefore the *Archetypal* and truly *Catholick Church* in *Heaven*, is That which is Chiefly and Principally meant by the *Holy Catholick Church*, and the *Communionof Saints* in the *Creed.* And *There* only is perfect *Unity.* *There*

[a] ii. Cor. vi. 14.

There is the Great *Body* of the *Church*, there are but few at a time upon *Earth*, and of them we know not which belong to that truely *Catholick Church* or not. And who do not, cannot be truly *Catholicks*, though they bear that Name with us. And of them so Called, you your selves will not say that there is Perfect *Unity* among them, in all the *Necessary* and most *Essential* Parts of it before Mentioned.

But if that Article in the *Creed* had been meant in your Sense, it must have been the *Holy Roman Catholick Church*, and not left us to seek where to find this *Church*, the *Infallible Guide*. And you your selves have not found it, while you are in quite Contrary Opinions where to find it. But by leaving it in the General and Indefinitely under the Name of the *Catholick Church* only, it is rather Exclusive of any Particular *Church*, and Extends to all *Christian Churches*, which make up the *Catholick Church* upon Earth, in such an *Unity* as our Fallen State will bear, where Human *Passions* are not Subdued, but mix themselves in our *Religious* as well as *Temporal* Concerns. Therefore by the *Unity* of the *Church* you cannot mean a *Perfect Unity*; no not even with your *Head*, and in *Doctrines* which are Indispensible towards your Eternal *Salvation*, as in the *Deposing Doctrine*, upon which the Apostle has Pronounced *Damnation*; and which, if not True, Cardinal *Perron*, as before Quoted, gives up the *Church* of *Rome*, for many Ages

paſt, for the very *Synagogue* of *Antichriſt*. See alſo the *Morals* of the *Jeſuits*, which though Condemned by ſome, are Defended by others. This is not *Perfect Unity*, even in *Neceſſaries*; and the *Bulla in Cæna* breaks it to pieces, where whole *Churches* and *Nations* are *Excommunicated* of thoſe you ſay are in the *Unity* of the *Church*, and in his *Communion* who has *Excommunicated* them!

But if we will be Content with no *Unity* in the *Church* but what is *Perfect* in all things, the Conſequence muſt be, that we have no *Unity* at all. As our Pretence to *Infallibility* is the greateſt Inſtance of our *Fallibility*. And if we will have no *Guide* but who is *Infallible*, we muſt have none upon Earth. And ſo the *Church* is render'd wholly uſeleſs to us, if we may not take their Help, as *Inſtructors* and Rational *Guides*, or in the *Apoſtles* Words, as (*a*) *Helpers of our Joy*, without giving them the *Dominion over our Faith*.

And indeed the Security you demand of an outward *Infallible* Guide, is Altering the Courſe of *Nature*, or as I called it, finding fault with the *Creation*; for *God* has made us *Rational* Creatures, and given us no other Guide but our own *Reaſon*, with the Aſſiſtance of His *Grace*, to come at the Knowledge of *Himſelf*, and Conſequently of all other things. And to find fault with this, is the *Clay* ſaying to

(*a*) 2 Cor. 1. 24.

to the *Potter*, *Why haſt thou made me thus!* To bid us Diveſt our ſelves wholly of our *Reaſon*, or to Believe *Implicitly*, which is the ſame thing; and is not in our Power, whatever we may think, becauſe *Reaſon* is our *Nature*; and that we ſhould not believe our Outward *Senſes*, is indeed to make us other *Creatures* than *God* has Made us. And to Refuſe the Aſſiſtance of a *Church*, becauſe ſhe is not *Infallible*, is Depriving our ſelves of a *Means* which *God* has Appointed; and is the ſame Perverſneſs, as if we ſhould refuſe to conſult a *Lawyer* or *Phyſician*, becauſe it is Poſſible they may Err in their Judgment. But tho' I allow their Skill to be better than mine, in their ſeveral Profeſſions, yet we ſtill keep to our ſelves ſo much Uſe of our *Reaſon*, that if I knew it was *Poyſon* the *Phyſician* were going to give me, I would not take it: And ther are ſome things ſo plain, that no *Lawyer* could Perſuade me to. Much more ought we to be careful in our *Eternal* Concerns, and not to give our ſelves up *Implicitly* to any whatſoever, that if they ſhould Direct us againſt the moſt Expreſs Commands in *Scripture*, or the Dictates of *Reaſon* and Common *Morality*, or bid us Deny all our *Senſes*, we muſt Acquieſce without Examining! This is Abandoning both *Senſe* and *Reaſon* which *God* gave us as a *Guide*, and therefore will Require it of us; and this only is that which will render us *Self-Condemned*, and bear Witneſs againſt us at the Laſt Day: For as I ſaid, It is not in our Power? to Extinguiſh *Rea-*

ſon in us, tho' we may Blindfold it and keep it down for a time, yet it will Recoil upon us, and Convict us, wherein we have Departed from it. Without this there could not be ſuch a thing as a *Sting* of *Conſcience*, for what is that but a *Check* to our *Reaſon*? What elſe is *Repentance*, or Returning from any *Error*, or from any *Evil* we have done? You endeavour to Convert Men to your *Church* wholly upon their *Reaſon*, for you can have no other Topick whereby to lay hold of an Adverſary: In vain therefore would you perſuade him to Truſt to that *Choice* of his *Reaſon* in Coming over to you, but never to Truſt any other *Choice* his *Reaſon* ſhould make afterwards, becauſe it is very *Fallible*; I ſay this could not go down with any Man, but it muſt make him Doubt whether his *Reaſon* has Led him Right in the firſt *Choice* too of going to your *Church*, and from the ſame Argument, becauſe his *Reaſon* is very *Fallible*. God ſays to us [a] *Come now and let us Reaſon together.* We ask no more of you. Nay, you cannot Refuſe it us, whether you will or not; for your own *Reaſon* will, as I ſaid, one time or other Return upon you, and Convince you of Obſtinacy in not hearkening to *Reaſon*, for without this you cannot be ſaid to have Acted according to *Reaſon*. This renders me Inexcuſable, whether I be *Right* or *Wrong*; for if my *Reaſon* Miſleads me after due *Examination*,

[a] Iſac. i, 18.

on, the *Error* is *Human*, and will be more eaſily Pardoned, but if I will not *Hear*, I will not open my *Eyes*, it mkes me *Guilty* though I were in the *Right*, becauſe that is by *Chance*, and not my *Choice* upon *Reaſonable Conviction*, which I have Refuſed. And *Truth* is never Afraid, for the more it is Canvaſſed it Appears the Brighter. It is ſtrange to ſee thoſe who Pretend to ſuch an Aſſurance as is *Infallible*, and yet ſeek to Avoid the Light of *Reaſon*, as if Afraid of being Detected! And to Confeſs it in the very Body of their *(a) Canon Law*, where they *Excommunicate* any *Laick*, who ſhall Publickly or Privately Diſpute concerning the *Catholick Faith*.

This Method will ſecure to them all that they have Caught: But if obſerved by others as well as by themſelves, they would never Catch another. And it is a plain Indication that who are againſt *Reaſon*, *Reaſon* is againſt them.

For if *Reaſon* could be heard, it would make it very Obvious to you, That in all the particular Points before mention'd, the *Certainty* is on our Side, and the *Doubt* (at leaſt) on yours. For Example, None make a *Doubt* but that we may lawfully Pray to *God*, and not before any *Image* of Him: Or without the

(a) Inhibemus quoque ne cuicunque Laicæ perſonæ liceat publice vel privatim de Fide Catholica diſputare. Qui vero contra fecerit, Excommunicationis laqueo innodetur.

Corp Jer. Can. Sext. Decretal. lib. Quint. Tit. ii. cap. ii. § 1. Paris. 1687.

Worſhip or Invocation of any *Saint* joined with Him; and ſo of all the Reſt. But on your part, if what I have ſaid make them not appear unlawful to your Lordſhip, yet they muſt remain at leaſt *Doubtful*, till ſome ſtronger *Evidence* be produced for them than has hitherto been given. There is not a Prayer in the Publick *Offices* of our *Church* to which you may not heartily ſay *Amen*, in full *Faith* and Aſſurance: Which is Impoſſible to ſay as to *Purgatory*, Invocation of *Saints*, &c. And then ſuch *Prayers* muſt be *Sinful*. *Rom.* xiv. 23.

But you are Pinned down in all theſe particular Points by the Authority of a ſuppoſed *Univerſal Biſhop*, wherein likewiſe you place the *Unity* of the *Church*. And yet ther never was ſuch a *Biſhop*, or Univerſal *Monarch*, unleſs any *Prince* calling himſelf ſo, would make him ſuch. What is an *Univerſal Monarch* who was never owned by Half of thoſe he calls his *Subjects*? And whoſe *Authority* is *Limited* and *Reſtrained*, and his *Excommunications* Deſpiſed, by thoſe who Pretend to own him, and to be Subject to him? What is it to Fancy ones ſelf *King* of all the *Earth*? And to place the *Unity* of the *World* in ſuch a *Monarch* as never was in the World? And to call thoſe *Rebels* from him, who never were in *Subjection* to him? This, My Lord, I have ſhewed to be the Caſe of the Greateſt Part of the *Chriſtian Churches*, and from the Beginning. And conſequently this *Univerſal Supremacy* is meerly *Imaginary*. It was never Named

med by *Christ*, nor ever was in Fact. And so far is it from being the *Center* of *Unity*, that the Pretence to it has been the Great *Breach* of *Unity* among *Christian Churches*, and is at this Day: For this is it which stops the *Bishops* in the Communion of *Rome* from Exercising the Freedom of their own Judgments, and that *Authority* which *Christ* has given them over their own Flocks, and will Require an Account of it from them; and which was freely Exercised by the *Bishops* in the Primitive Church; and which, if Restored, would open the way to that *Catholick Communion* so greatly Desired, and wherein the true *Unity* of the *Church* does Consist. Which never can be Hoped, while a *Negative* is given to the *Pope* in all the particular Points disputed, and especially concerning his own *Supremacy*. But if the *Bishops* of his Communion would think themselves at Liberty and under Obligation to Act of themselves, as in the Primitive *Church*; and as ordained by *Christ*; the Points we have Discoursed as to *Doctrine* and *Worship* seem to me so very Plain, that ther could be no Dispute, which were the Safer Side to take: At least that it would not be thought a *Sin* so to Purge their Publick *Offices* as that other *Christians* might lawfully join in them: And let *Opinions* remain as *Opinions*, not made *Articles* of *Faith*, and *Conditions* of *Communion*. And to this nothing stands in the Way of the *Bishops* of *France*, at least, but the fear of that *Excommunication* from the *Pope* which is Renewed against them eve-

ry Year, and which they Pretend not to Regard. But they are kept under by the Shadow of the Phantom of an *Univerſal Supremacy*, which never was in Being; and if it were, would be Inſupportable and Ruin the *Church*; and which they themſelves have in Effect already Rejected, as Inconſiſtent with the Liberties of the *Gallican* or any other *National* Church; and has bred all the Diſpute betwixt them and the *Church* of *Rome*. And can never be Healed in good Earneſt, if the *Pope* be Judge of the Controverſy. See then the Cauſe of the *Breach* of *Catholick* Unity.

And now, My Lord, forgive me, for I am ſenſible that ther is an Uneaſineſs at firſt and a Prejudice to hear any thing Contrary to thoſe *Principles* in which one has been Educated from his Infancy, and thinks moſt Certain. But this muſt be overcome ſo far as to hear *Reaſon*, which will Confirm us the more if we be in the *Truth*, or otherwiſe Convince us of our *Error*, at leaſt make it ſo far Excuſable, that we have not Refuſed the Reaſonable Means of Information: Without this, no Man could have been a *Chriſtian* at firſt, nor has been ſince but by Accident, according to the Place where he was Born, or received his *Education*. But the *Prophet* calls a due Examination of theſe things (*a*) a *ſhewing our ſelves to be Men*. And the *Apoſtles* gives it the Character of a

Nobleneſs

(*a*) Iſai. xlvi. 8.

Nobleneſs of Spirit in thoſe who (*b*) *Searched the Scriptures daily, whether thoſe things were ſo.* And *therefore* (ſays he) *Many of them Believed*, of the *Honourable* both *Men* and *Women*. Whilſt thoſe *Bigotted* who Stuck to *Implicit Faith* in the *Church*, it is ſaid, (*c*) *Believed not*, but were *Moved with Envy*, and Stirred up *Perſecution* againſt thoſe who Diſturbed them in their *Security*, like Waking one out of his *Sleep*, though when it is done, he will Thank thoſe who have Raiſed him from *Darkneſs* to *Light*, to *Seeing* with his own *Eyes*, inſtead of being Led by others *Implicitly* in the *Dark*, and Lulled into *Dreams* of *Security* from his *Blindneſs*, in which he is Perſuaded ther is leſs Danger of *Stumbling*, than if his *Eyes* were open, becauſe every Man's *Sight* is not Good, and has Deceived Many! Have I not taken a *Horſe* for a *Man* at a Diſtance? And does not a *Stick* look *Crooked* in the *Water*? Why then ſhould I truſt my *Eyes* any more? This is all the *Reaſon* ever I could hear for not truſting to our *Reaſon*! And what is the Remedy propoſed? If it were to give us Rules whereby to Judge of true *Reaſon*, to *Help* it, and to *Trim* this *Lamp* which *God* has *Lighted* for us, this would be *Rational*, like *Clearing* our *Eyes* if they were *Dim*: But the Remedy you propoſe, is, to Shut *Reaſon* quite out, to make no more Uſe of it, to *Silence*, to *Extinguiſh* it; and take *Implicit Faith* in its Room; like pulling out one's *Eyes*, becauſe they are not Good, and Chooſe to be Led by

(*b*) Act. xvii. 11, 12. (*c*) Ver. 5.

by the Hand, and never Examine our Way any more? But I think the *Apoſtle* recommends *Examining* to us, and I will Conclude with his Advice,

Prove all things; and hold faſt that which is Good. 1 Theſſ. v. 21.

Books *Deciſive* and not *Anſwered.*

Dr. *Barrow* of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and the *Unity of the Church.* 1680.

Dr. *Coſin* (ſince Biſhop of *Durham*) his *Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of the Holy Scripture.* 1657.
This is concerning the *Apocryphal* Books.

His *Hiſtory of Tranſ-ſubſtantiation* (the *Engliſh* Tranſlation) 1676. Writ in *Latin.* 1657.

The Devotions of the Roman Church 1674.
This is concerning the *Invocation* of *Saints*, of *Reliques*, and the *Legends.*

The incurable Sceptiſm of the Church of Rome. 1688.
This is concerning the *Rule* of *Faith.*

FINIS.

Ex Bullario Laertii Cherubini, Romæ 1638.

TOM. III. p. 183.

Conſtitutio Pauli V. 63.

EXcommunicatio & Anathematizatio quorumcunq; Hæreticorum, eorumq; fautorum ac Schiſmaticorum, vel Eccleſiaſticam Libertatem lædentium, aut quoquo modo diſpoſitis in hac Bulla, de more in die Cænæ Domini publicare ſolita contravenientium.

Quoad omnia quaſi Capitula hujus Bullæ (ultra Extravagan. 3. *Pauli* II. & Extravagan. 5. *Sixti* IV. in tit. de Pœnitentia & Remiſſionibus)

The Sixty third Conſtitution of *Paul* V.

THE Excommunication and Anathematization of all Hereticks whatſoever, and their favourers, and Schiſmaticks, or of thoſe who violate the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty, or any ways infringe the Contents of this Bull, which is wont to be publiſhed on Maunday-Thurſday.

As for almoſt all the Chapters of this Bull, (beſides the 3d Extravagant of Paul II. *and the 5th Extravagant of* Sixtus IV. *in the Title of*

onibus habes ſupra Conſtitut. 1 *Urbani* V. *fol.* 215. Conſtitut. 25. *Julii* II. *f.* 482. Conſtitut. 10. *Pauli* III. *f.* 522. necnon Conſtitut. 81. *Gregorii* XIII. *f.* 348. *l.* 2. Aliorum autem Bullas ejuſmodi Cænæ Domini nuncupantes volens prætermiſi, his duntaxat contentus, ex quibus pro temporum conditione Romanos Pontifices aliquid immutaſſe cognoſcatur. Non tamen poſthabui proxime indicandas, uti apprime neceſſarias, & ſuper hujus Bullæ capitibus ſpecialiter editas.

Extat ergo in hoc Opere ſpecialis edita ſanctio *Nicolai* III. circa § primum hujus Bullæ in ejus Conſt. 2. ſup. *fol.* 143. & circa § 2. extat Conſt. 5. *Pii* II. *f.* 290 *l.* 1. Circa § 4. extat Conſt. 7. *Pii*

Penance and Remiſſions) *you have them before ordained in the firſt Conſtitution of* Urban V. f. 215. *in the* 25*th Conſt. of* Julius II. f. 482. *in the* 10*th Conſt. of* Paul III. f. 522. *and in the* 81*ſt. Conſt. of* Gregori XIII. f. 348. lib. 2. *Other Bulls if this nature, called Bulls* in Cænæ Domini, *I have purpoſely omitted, being content with theſe; from which it may appear that the Popes have made ſome Variation in them, according to the Exigency of the Times. Yet I would not omit thoſe which follow, as being eſpecially neceſſary, and particularly publiſhed upon the ſeveral Chapters of this Bull.*

There is extant therefore in this Collection, a particular Edict of Nicolas III. *about the* 1*ſt Section of this Bull in his* 2*d Conſtitution,* Sup. fol. 143. *concerning* Sect. 2. *there is extant Conſt.* 5. *of* Pius II. f. V.

V. *f.* 137. *l.* 2. Circa § 7. extat Conſt. 3. *Nicolai* V. *f.* 283. *l.* 1. Circa § 10 extat Canon *Calliſti.* l. in *c.* 23. cauſ. 24. *q.* 3. Circa § 11. reſpectu Cardinalium extat Conſt. 16. *Leonis* X. *f.* 420. *l.* 1 & alia 93. *Pii* V. *f.* 222. *l.* 2. Circa § 12. extat Conſt. 11. *Alexandri* VI. *f.* 352. Circa § 14. extat. Conſt. 2. *Martini* V. *f.* 239. & alia 17. *Innocentii* VIII. *f.* 343. ac altera 30. *Leonis* IX. *f.* 440 necnon alia 39. *Clementis* VII. *f.* 505. *l.* 1. & altera 19. *Gregorii* XIII. *f.* 290. *l.* 2 Circa § 15. multi ſunt Canones in Corpore Juris, & extat Conſt. 10. *Martini* V. *f.* 247. Circa § 19. extat Conſt. 3. *Urbani* VI. *f.* 222. Et Circa § 20 extat Conſt. 8. *Joannes* XXII. *f.* 174. & alia 3. *Clementis* VI. *f.* 212. alia 13. *Leonis* 290 l. 1. *concerning* § 4. *there is extant*, *Conſt.* 7. *of* Pius V. f. 137. l. 2. *concerning* § 7. *is extant*, *Conſt.* 3. *of* Nicolas V. f. 283. l. 1. *concerning* § 10. *is extant a* Canon *of* Caliſtus. *in c.* 23. *Conſt.* 24. *qu.* 3. *Concerning* § 11. *in reſpect of the Cardinals is extant Conſt.* 16. *of* Leo X. f. 420. l. 1. *and Conſt.* 93. *of* Pius V. f. 222. l. 2. *Concerning* § 12. *is extant Conſt.* 11. *of* Alexander VI. f. 352. *Concerning* § 14. *is extant Conſt.* 2. *of* Martin V. f. 293. *and Conſt.* 17. *of* Innocent VIII. f. 343. *and Conſt.* 30. *of* Leo X. f. 440. *and Conſt.* 39. *of* Clement VII. f. 505. l. 1. *and Conſt.* 19. *of* Gregory XIII. f. 290. l. 2. *Concerning* § 15. *are many Canons in the Body of the Law*, *and Conſt.* 10. *of* Martin V. f. 247.

X. f. 314. & altera 11 *Pauli* IV. f. 595.

Concerning § 19. *is extant Conſt.* 3. *of* Urban VI. f. 222. *Concerning* § 20. *is extant Conſt.* 8. *of* John XXII. f. 174. *and Conſt.* 3. *of* Clement VI. f. 212. *and Conſt.* 13. *of* Leo X. f. 314. *and Conſt.* 11. *of* Paul IV. f. 595.

Alia hujuſmodi Excommunicatio in die Cœnæ Domini Promulgari ſolita eſt in S. D. N. *Urbani* VIII. Conſt. 62. Paſtoralis infr. Tom. 4.

Another like Excommunication uſually publiſhed on Maun-day Thurſday, *is extant in the 62d Conſtitution of our Holy Lord* Urban VIII. *inf. Tom.* 4.

Paulus Epiſcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Paul Biſhop, Servant of the Servants of God, in perpetual memory of the thing now Decreed.

PAſtoralis *Romani* Pontificis vigilantia & ſollicitudo, cum in omni Reipublicæ Chriſtianæ pace & tranquillitate procuranda pro ſui muneris officio aſſidue verſatur, tum potiſſimum in Catho-

THE Paſtoral vigilance and care of the Biſhop of Rome, *being by the Duty of his Office continually employed in procuring by all means the Peace and tranquillity of Chriſtendom is more eſpecially eminent*

licæ

licæ fidei ſine qua impoſſibile eſt placere Deo, unitate atq; integritate retinenda, maxime elucet: Nimirûm ut fideles Chriſti non ſint parvuli fluctuantes, neq; circumferanter omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum ad circumventionem erroris, ſed omnes occurrant in unitate fidei & agnitionis Filii Dei in virum perfectum, neq; ſe in hujus vitæ ſocietate & communione lædant, aut inter ſe alter alteri offenſionem præbeant, ſed potius in vinculo charitatis conjuncti, tanquam unius corporis membra ſub Chriſto capite, ejuſq; in terris Vicario *Romano* Pontifice Beatiſſimi *Petri* Succeſſore, a quo totius Eccleſia unitas dimanat, augeantur in ædificatione, atq; ita divina gratia adjutrice ſic præſentis vitæ quiere gaudeant,

in retaining and preſerving the unity and integrity of Catholick Faith; without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God: That ſo the faithful of Chriſt may not be as Children wavering, nor be carried about with every wind of Doctrine by the cunning craft of men, whereby they lay in wait to deceive; but that all may meet in the unity of the Faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man: That in the communion and ſociety of this life they may not injure nor offend one another; but rather being joined together with the bond of Charity, as members of one body under Chriſt the Head, and his Vicar upon Earth the Biſhop of Rome, *St.* Peter's *Succeſſor, from whom the unity of the whole Church doth flow, may be increaſed in edification, and by the aſſiſtance of the Divine*

deant, ut futura quoque beatitudine perfruantur. Ob quas sane causas *Romani* Pontifices prædecessores nostri hodierna die, quæ anniversaria Dominicæ Cœnæ commemoratione solennis est, spiritualem Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ gladium, et salutaria justitiæ arma per ministerium summi Apostolatus ad Dei gloriam et animarum salutem solenniter exercere consueverunt. Nos igitur, quibus nihil optabilius est, quam fidei inviolatam integritatem, publicam Pacem et Justitiam, Deo autore, tueri, vetustum et solennem hunc morem sequentes.

Grace may so enjoy the tranquility of this present life, that they may also attain eternal happiness. For which Reasons the Bishops of Rome, *our Predecessors, upon this day which is dedicated to the Aniversary commemoration of our Lord's Supper, have been wont sollemnly to exercise the Spiritual Sword of Ecclesiastical Discipline and wholsome Weapons of Justice by the Ministry of the Supreme Apostolate to the glory of God and salvation of Souls. We therefore, desiring nothing more than by the guidance of God to preserve inviolable the integrity of Faith, publick Peace and Justice; following this ancient and solemn Custom.*

§ 1. Excommunicamus et anathematizamus ex parte Dei Omnipotentis, Patris & Filii et Spiritus Sancti, auctoritate quoque

§. 1. *We excommunicate and anathematize in the name of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the Blessed Apo-*

Beatorum

Beatorum Apoſtolorum *Petri* et *Pauli*, ac noſtra, quoſcunq; Huſſitas, Vuichlephiſtas, Luterannos, Zuinglianos, Calviniſtas, Ugonottos, Anabaptiſtas, Trinitarios, et a Chriſtiana fide Apoſtatas, ac omnes et ſingulos alias Hæreticos, quocunque nomine cenſeantur, et cujuſcunque ſectæ exiſtant; ac eis credentes, eorumque receptatores, fautores, et generaliter quoſlibet illorum defenſores; ac eorundem libros hæreſin continentes, vel de Religione tractantes ſine auctoritate noſtra et Sedis Apoſtolicæ ſcienter legentes aut retinentes, imprimentes, ſeu quomodolibet defendentes, ex quavis cauſa publice vel occulte, quovis ingenio vel colore; necnon Schiſmaticos, et eos qui ſe a noſtra et *Romani*

ſtles Peter *and* Paul, *and by our own, all Huſſites, Weclephiſts, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calviniſts, Hugonots, Anabaptiſts, Trinitarians, and Apoſtates from the Chriſtian Faith, and all other Hereticks by whatſoever name they are called, and of whatſoever Sect they be: As alſo their adherents, Receivers, Favourers, and generally any Defenders of them; together with all who without our Authority, or that of the Apoſtolick See, knowingly read, keep, print, or any ways for any cauſe whatſoever publickly or privately on any pretext or colour, defend their Books containing Hereſie, or treating of Religion; as alſo Schiſmaticks, and thoſe who withdraw themſelves, or recede obſtinately from the obedience of us, or the Biſhop of* Rome *for the time being.*

Pontificis pro tempore exiſtentis obedientia pertinacitur ſubtrahunt vel recedunt.

§ 2. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & ſingulos, cujuſcunq; ſtatus, gradus, ſeu conditionis fuerint Univerſitates Collegia & Capitula, quocunque nomine nuncupentur, interdicimus, ab ordinationibus ſeu mandatis noſtris ac *Romanorum* Pontificum pro tempore exiſtentium ad Univerſale futurum Concilium appellantes; necnon eos quorum auxilio vel favore appellatum fuerit.

§ 2. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all and ſingular, of whatſoever ſtation, degree or condition they be; and interdict all Univerſities, Colleges and Chapters, by whatſoever name they are called; who appeal from the Orders or Decrees of Us, or the Popes of* Rome *for the time being to a future General Council; and thoſe by whoſe aid and favour the Appeal was made.*

§ 3. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes Piratas, Curſarios ac Latrunculos Maritimos, diſcurrentes Mare noſtrum, præcipue a Monte *Argentario* uſque ad *Terracinam*, ac omnes eorum fautores,

§ 3. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all Pirates, Corſairs and Robbers by Sea, roving about our Sea chiefly from Mount* Argentiere *to* Terracina, *and all their Abetters, Receivers and Defenders.*

receptatores

receptatores & defensores.

§ 4. Item Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & singulos, qui Christianorum quorumcunq; navibus tempestate, seu in transversum (ut dici solet) jactatis, vel quoquo modo naufragium passis, seu in ipsis navibus, sive ex eisdem ejecta in mare, vel in littore inventa, cujuscunq; generis bona, tam in nostris, *Tyrrheni & Adriatici*, quam in cæteris cujusque Maris regionibus & littoribus, surripuerint; ita ut nec ob quodcunque Privilegium, Consuetudinem, aut longissimi etiam immemorabilis temporis possessionem, seu alium quemcunque prætextum excusari possint.

§ 4. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all and singular, who when the Ships of any Christians are either driven out of the way by Tempest, or any ways suffer shipwrack, convey away any Goods of what kind soever, either in the Shipe themselves, or cast out of the Ships into the Sea, or found on the Shore, as well in our* Tyrrhenian *and* Adriatick *Seas, as in any other Divisions of Shores of all Seas whatsoever; so that they shall not be excused by any Privilege, Custom, or possession of time immemorial or any other pretext whatsoever.*

§ 5. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes qui in terris suis nova Pe-

§ 5. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who impose or augment any new Tolls or*

dagia seu Gabellas, præterquam in casibus sibi a jure, seu ex speciali sedis Apostolicæ licentia permissis, imponunt vel augent, seu imponi vel augeri prohibita exigunt.

§ 6. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes falsarios literarum Apostolicarum, etiam in forma Brevis, ac Supplicationum, Gratiam vel Justitiam concernentium, per *Romanum* Pontificem, vel *S. R. E.* Vicecancellarios seu gerentes vices eorum, aut de mandato ejusdem Pontificis signatarum, necnon falso publicantes literas Apostolicas, etiam in forma Brevis, & etiam falso signantes Supplicationes hujusmodi sub nomine *Romani* Pontificis seu Vicecancellarii, aut gerentium vices prædictorum.

Gabells in their Dominions, except in cases permitted to them by Law, or by especial leave of the Apostolick See; or, who exact such Taxes forbidden to be imposed or augmented.

§ 6. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all Forgers of Apostolick Letters, even in form of a Brief, and of Supplications respecting Indulgence or Justice, signed by the Pope of* Rome, *or by the Vice-chancellors of the Holy See of* Rome, *or by their Deputies, or by the command of the said Pope; as also those who falsly publish the Apostolick Letters, even in form of a Brief; and those who falsly sign such Supplications in the name of the Pope of* Rome, *or the Vice-chancellor, or their Deputies.*

§ 7. Item Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes illos, qui ad *Saracenos*, *Turcas*, & alios Chriſtiani nominis hoſtes, & inimicos, vel Hæreticos per noſtras vel hujus Sanctæ Sedis ſententias expreſſe vel nominatim declaratos deferunt ſeu tranſmittunt Equos, Arma, Ferrum, filum Ferri, Stannum, Chalybem, omniaque Metallorum genera atque Bellica Inſtrumenta, Lignamina, Canapem, Funes, tam ex ipſo Canape quam alia quacunque materia, & ipſam materiam, aliaque hujuſmodi, quibus Chriſtianos & Catholicos impugnant; nec non illos qui per ſe vel per alios de rebus ſtatum Chriſtianæ Reipublicæ concernentibus, in *Chriſtianorum* perniciem & damnum ipſos *Turcas* & Chriſtianæ Religionis inimicos, necnon

§ 7. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all thoſe, who carry or tranſmit to the* Saracens, Turks, *and other Enemies and Foes of the Chriſtian Religion, or to thoſe who are expreſly and by name declared Hereticks by the Sentence of us, or of this Holy See, Horſes, Arms, Iron, Wire of Iron, Tin, Steel, and all kind of Metals, and Warlike Inſtruments, Timber, Hemp, Ropes made as well of Hemp as of any other matter, & that matter whatſoever it be, and other things of this nature, which they make uſe of to the prejudice of Chriſtians and Catholicks: As alſo thoſe who by themſelves or others give intelligence of matters relating to the State of Chriſtendom to the* Turks *and Enemies of the Chriſtian Religion to the hurt and prejudice of Chriſtians, or to Hereticks to the Prejudice of*

Hæreticos, in damnum Catholicæ Religionis, certiores faciunt, illisque ad id auxilium, consilium, vel favorem quomodo libet præstant. Non obstantibus quibuscunq; Privilegiis, quibusvis Personis, Principibus, Rebuspublicis per nos & Sedem prædictam hactenus concessis, de hujusmodi prohibitione expressam mentionem non facientibus.

the Catholick Religion, or who any ways afford to them counsel, assistance or favour; notwithstanding any Privileges hitherto granted by Us and the aforesaid See to any Persons, Princes or Common-wealths; wherein express mention is not made of this prohibition.

§. 8. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes impedientes seu invadentes eos, qui victualia seu alia ad usum *Romanæ* Curiæ necessaria adducunt, ac etiam eos qui ne ad *Romanum* Curiam adducantur vel afferantur prohibent, impediunt seu perturbant, seu hæc facientes defendunt per se vel per alios, cujuscunque fuerint ordinis, præminenti, conditionis

§. 8. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all hindering or invading those, who bring Provisions, or any other things necessary, for the use of the Court of* Rome; *as also those who forbid, hinder or obstruct the bringing or conducting of them to the Court of* Rome; *or who abet the doers of these things either by themselves, or by others; of whatsoever order pre-eminence, condition or quality they be,*

nis

nis & ſtatus, etiamſi Pontificali ſeu Regali aut alia quavis Eccleſiaſtica vel mundana præfulgeant dignitate.

even although they be Biſhops or Kings, or inveſted with any other Eccleſiaſtical or Secular Dignity.

§. 9. Item Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui ad ſedem Apoſtolicam venientes, & recedentes ab eadem, ſua vel aliorum opera interficiunt, mutilant, ſpoliant, capiunt, detinent; necnon illos omnes qui juriſdictionem ordinariam vel delegatam a nobis vel noſtris Judicibus non habentes, illam ſibi temere vendicantes ſimilia contra morantes in eadem Curia audent perpetrare.

§ 9. *Farther, We excommunicate and anathematize all thoſe, who kill, maim, ſpoil, apprehend or detain by themſelves, or by others, thoſe who come to the Apoſtolick See, or return from it; as alſo all thoſe who having no ordinary juriſdiction, nor any deligated by Us or our Judges, raſhly challenging it to themſelves, preſume to commit any like Actions againſt thoſe who reſide at the Court of* Rome.

§. 10. Item Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes interficientes, mutilantes, vulnerantes, detinentes, capientes ſeu deprædantes Romipe-

§. 10. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who kill, maim, wound, detain, apprehend, or rob Travellers to* Rome; *or Pilgrims for the ſake of*

tas

tas ſeu Perigrinos ad Urbem cauſa Devotionis accedentes, et in ea morantes, vel ab ipſa recedentes, et in his dantes auxilium, conſilium, vel favorem.

Devotion or Pilgrimage going to that City, ſtaying in it, or returning from it; and thoſe who give aid, counſel or favour in theſe caſes.

§ 11. Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes interficientes, vulnerantes, mutilantes, percutientes, capientes, carcerantes, detinentes, vel hoſtiliter inſequentes S. R. E. Cardinales, ac Patriarchas, Archiepiſcopos, Epiſcopos, Sediſq; Apoſtolicæ Legatos vel nuncios, aut eos a ſuis Diœceſibus, Territoriis, Terris, ſeu Dominiis ejicientes, necnon ea mandantes vel rata habentes, ſeu præſtantes in eis auxilium, conſilium, vel favorem.

§ 11. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who ſlay, wound, maim, ſtrike, apprehend, impriſon, detain, or in hoſtile manner purſue the Cardinals of the Holy Church of* Rome, *and Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Legats, or Nuncios of the Apoſtolick See; or thoſe who drive them out of their Territories, Dioceſſes, Lands or Dominions; or thoſe who command or allow theſe things to be done, or give aid, counſel and favour to them.*

§ 12. Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui per ſe vel per alios,

§ 12. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all thoſe, who by themſelves or by others*

perſonas

perſonas Eccleſiaſticas quaſcunque, vel ſeculares ad *Romanam* Curiam ſuper eorum cauſis et negotiis recurrentes, ac illa in eadem Curia proſequentes aut procurantes negotiorumque geſtores, advocatos, procuratores et agentes, ſeu etiam Auditores vel Judices ſuper dictis cauſis vel negotiis deputatos, occaſione cauſarum vel negotiorum hujuſmodi occidunt ſeu quoquo modo percutiunt, bonis ſpoliant; ſeu qui per ſe vel per alios, directe vel indirecte delicta hujuſmodi committere exequi vel procurare, aut in eiſdem auxilium, conſilium vel favorem præſtare non verentur, cujuſcunque præeminentiæ et dignitatis fuerint.

ſlay or any ways ſtrike or deſpoil any Eccleſiaſtical or Secular Perſons having recourſe to the Court of Rome *for their Cauſes and Affairs, and proſecuting and managing them in the ſaid Court, or even the Auditors or Judges deputed for the hearing and managing of the ſaid Cauſes and Affairs, upon occaſion of theſe Cauſes and Affairs; as alſo thoſe who by themſelves or by others directly or indirectly preſume to act or procure the ſaid Crimes, or to give aid, counſel or favour to them, of whatſoever preheminence or dignity they be.*

§ 13. Item Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes tam Eccleſiaſticos quam Seculares, cujuſcunque

§ 13. *Further We excommunicate and anathematize all thoſe as well Eccleſiaſticks as Seculars, of whatſoever dig-*

dignitatis,

dignitatis, qui prætexentes frivolam quandam appellationem a gravamine vel futura executione literarum Apoſtolicarum etiam in forma Brevis, tam gratiam quam juſtitiam concernentium, necnon citationum, inhibitionum, ſequeſtrationum, monitoriorum, proceſſuum, executorialium, & aliorum Decretorum, a Nobis & Sede prædicta ſeu Legatis, Nunciis, Præſidentibus, Palatii noſtri & Cameræ Apoſtolicæ Auditoribus, Commiſſariis, aliiſque Judicibus & delegatis Apoſtolicis emanatorum, & quæ pro tempore emanaverint, aut alias ad Curias Sæculares & Laicam poteſtatem recurrent, & ab ea inſtante etiam Fiſci Procuratore & Advocato, appellationes hujuſmodi admitti, ac lites, citationes, inhibitiones,

nity they be, who under pretence of a certain frivolous appeal from the injuſtice or future execution of the Apoſtolick Letters, even in form of a Brieve, reſpecting as well indulgence as juſtice, as alſo from the injuſtice, and future execution of Citations, Inhibitions, Sequeſtrations, Monitories, Proceſſes, Executorials and other Degrees, iſſuing out, or which ſhall at any time iſſue out from Us and the aforeſaid See, or our Legates, Nuncios, or Preſidents, from the Auditors of our Palace and Apoſtolick Chamber, from our Commiſſaries, and other Apoſtolick Judges and Delegates: as alſo thoſe, who any other ways have recourſe to Secular Courts and the Lay Power; and who cauſe ſuch Appeals to be admitted by the Secular Courts, even although the Procurator and Advocate of the Exchequer

hibitiones, ſequeſtra, monitoria, & alia prædicta, capi & retineri faciunt. Quive illa ſimplicitur, vel ſine eorum beneplacito & conſenſu vel examine executione, demandari, aut ne Tabelliones & Notarii ſuper hujuſmodi literarum & proceſſuum executione, inſtrumenta vel acta conficere, aut confecta parti cujus intereſt, tradere debeant, impediunt vel prohibent, ac etiam partes ſeu eorum agentes, conſanguineos, affines, familiares, notarios, executores & ſub-executores literarum, citationum, monitoriorum, & aliorum prædictorum capiunt, percutiunt, vulnerant, carcerant, detinent, ex Civitatibus, Locis, & Regnis ejiciunt, bonis ſpoliant, perterrefaciunt, concutiunt & comminantur per ſe vel per alium ſeu alios,

ſhould require it; or who cauſe the aforeſaid Letters, Citations, Inhibitions, Sequeſtrations, Monitories, &c. to be ſeized or retained; or thoſe who hinder or forbid the ſaid Letters to be put in execution, either ſimply or without their good will, conſent or examination; or who hinder or forbid Scriveners or Notaries from making or delivering when made to the Parties concerned any Inſtruments or Acts concerning the Execution of theſe Letters and Proceſſes; or who apprehend, ſtrike, wound, impriſon, detain; drive out of Cities, Places and Kingdoms, deſpoil of their Goods, terrify, vex, and threaten either by themſelves, or by others, publickly or privately, the Parties or their Agents, Kindred on both ſides, their Friends, Notaries, the Executors or Sub-executors of the ſaid

publice vel occulte ; quive alias quibuſcunque perſonis in genere vel in ſpecie, ne pro quibuſvis eorum negotiis proſequendis ſeu gratiis vel literis impetrandis ad *Romanam* Curiam accedant, aut recurſum habeant, ſeu gratias ipſas vel literas a dicta Sede impetrent ſeu impetratis utantur, directe vel indirecte prohibere, ſtatuere ſeu mandare, vel eas apud ſe aut notarios ſeu Tabelliones, vel alias quomodolibet retinere præſumunt.

Letters, Citations, Monitories, &c. *or who any other way preſume directly or indirectly to forbid, ordain and command, any Perſons in general or in particular, to betake themſelves, or have recourſe to the See of* Rome *to proſecute their Affairs of any kind, or to obtain Indulgences or Letters, or who forbid them to obtain the ſaid Indulgences, or to make uſe of them when obtained of the ſaid See ; or who preſume to retain the ſaid Indulgences in their own hands, or in the hands of a Notary or a Scrivener or any other way.*

§ 14. Item excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & ſingulos, qui per ſe vel alios auctoritate propria ac de facto, quarumcunq; exemptionum vel aliarum gratiarum & literarum Apoſtolicarum prætextu, beneficiales, & dicimarum, ac alias

§ 14. *Further, We Excommunicate and Anathematize all and ſingular, who by themſelves or by others, by their own Authority and* de facto, *under pretence of any exemptions, or any other Apoſtolick Indulgences and Letters, take away the cognizance of Benefices and Tithes, and other*

cauſas

cauſas ſpirituales ac ſpiritualibus annexas, ab Auditoribus & Commiſſariis noſtris, aliiſq; Judicibus Eccleſiaſticis avocant; illarumve curſum & audientiam; ac perſonas, capitula, Conventus, Collegia, cauſas ipſas proſequi volentes impediunt ac ſe de illarum cognitione tanquam Judices interponunt. Quive partes actrices, quæ illas committi fecerunt, & faciunt ad revocandum & revocari faciendum citationes vel inhibitiones aut alias literas in eis decretas, & ad faciendum vel conſentiendum eos contra quos tales inhibitiones emanarunt a cenſuris et pœnis in illis contentis abſolvi, per ſtatutum vel alias compellunt; vel executionem literarum Apoſtolicarum ſeu executorialium, proceſſuum ac

ſpiritual Cauſes, or annexed to ſpirituals from our Auditors and Commiſſaries, and other Eccleſiaſtical Judges; and hinder the proceeding and audience of them, and the Perſons, Chapters, Convents, Colleges, deſiring to proſecute the ſaid Cauſes; or who intrude themſelves as Judges in the Cognizance of them; or who by order, or any other way compel the Plaintiffs to withdraw, or cauſe to be withdrawn, their Citations, or Inhibitions; or any other Letters decreed in the ſpiritual Court; and the Defendants againſt whom ſuch Inhibitions were iſſued out, to procure, or conſent to be abſolved from the Cenſures or Puniſhments contained in them; or who any ways hinder the execution of Apoſtolick Letters, Executorials, Proceſſes and Decrees aforeſaid; or give their allowance, councel,

decretorum prædictorum quomodolibet impediunt, vel ſuum ad id favorem, conſilium aut aſſenſum præſtans, etiam prætextu violentiæ prohibendæ, vel aliarum prætenſionum, ſeu etiam, donec ipſi ad nos informandos, ut dicunt, ſupplicaverint aut ſupplicari fecerint; niſi ſupplicationes hujuſmodi coram Nobis & ſede Apoſtolica legitime proſequantur, etiamſi talia committentes fuerint, Præſidentes Cancellariarum, Conſiliorum, Parlamentorum, Cancellarii, Vicecancellarii, Conſiliarii, ordinarii vell extraordinarii quorumcunq; Principum Sæcularium; etiamſi Imperiali, Regali, Ducali, vel alia quacunq; præfulgeant dignitate; aut Archiepiſcopi, Epiſcopi, Abbates Commendatarii ſeu Vicarii fuerint.

or aſſent to it, even under pretence of hindring violence, or any other pretexts whatſoever, or even until they ſhall Petition us, or cauſe us to be Petitioned for our better information, as is commonly pretended, unleſs they proſecute ſuch Petitions before us and the Apoſtolick See in lawful form; even although thoſe who commit ſuch things ſhould be Preſidents of Chanceries, Councils, or Parliaments, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, ordinary or extraordinary Councellors of any ſecular Princes (whether they be Emperors, Kings, Dukes, or any other dignity) or Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Abbots, Commendataries or Vicars.

§

§ 15. Quive ex eorum pretenſo officio, vel ad inſtantiam partis, aut aliorum quorumcunq; perſonas Eccleſiaſticas, Capitula, Conventus, Collegia Eccleſiarum quarumcunq; coram ſe ad ſuum Tribunal, Audientiam, Cancellariam, Concilium, vel Parlamentum, præter juris Canonici diſpoſitionem, trahunt, vel trahi faciunt vel procurant, directe vel indirecte, quovis quæſito colore; necnon qui ſtatuta, ordinationes, conſtitutiones, pragmaticas, ſeu quævis alia decreta in genere vel in ſpecie, ex quavis cauſa & quovis quæſito colore, ac etiam prætextu cujuſvis conſuetudinis & privilegii, vel alias quomodolibet fecerint, ordinaverint & publicaverint, vel factis & ordinatis uſi fuerint, unde libertates Eccleſiaſtica

§ 15. *Alſo thoſe who under pretence of their Office, or at the inſtance of any party, or of any others, draw, or cauſe and procure to be drawn, directly, or indirectly, upon any pretext whatſoever, Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, Chapters, Convents, Colleges of any Churches, before them to their Tribunal, Audience, Chancery, Counſel, or Parliament, againſt the Rules of the Canon-Law; as alſo thoſe who for any cauſe, or under any pretext, or by pretence of any Cuſtom or Privilege, or any other way, ſhall make, enact, and publiſh any Statutes, Orders, Conſtitutions, Pragmaticks, or any other Degrees in general or in particular; or ſhall uſe them when made and enacted; whereby the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty is violated, or any ways injured or depreſſed; or by any other means reſtrained; or whereby the Rights of us and of the*

ſtica

ſtica tollitur, ſeu in aliquo læditur vel deprimitur, aut alio quovis modo reſtringitur, ſeu noſtris & dictæ ſedis, ac quarumcunq; eccleſiarum jurisdictionibus quomodolibet directe vel indirecte, tacite vel expreſſe præjudicantur.

ſaid See, and of any other Churches, are any way directly or indirectly, tacitely or expreſly prejudged.

§ 16. Necnon qui Archiepiſcopos, Epiſcopos, alioſq; ſuperiores & inferiores Prælatos, & omnes alios quoſcunq; Judices Eccleſiaſticos ordinarios quomodolibet hac de cauſa directe vel indirecte, carcerando vel moleſtando eorum agentes, procuratores, familiares, necnon conſanguineos & affines, aut alias impediunt, quo minus juriſdictione ſua Eccleſiaſtica contra quoſcunque utantur, ſecundum quod Canones & ſacræ conſtitutiones Eccleſiaſticæ, & decreta Conciliorum Generalium, & præſertim

§. 16. *Alſo thoſe who upon this account directly or indirectly hinder Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and other ſuperior and inferior Prelates, and all other ordinary Eccleſiaſtical Judges whatſoever by any means, either by impriſoning or moleſting their Agents, Proctors, Domeſticks, kindred on both ſides, or by any other way from exerting their Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction againſt any perſons whatſoever, according as the Canons and ſacred Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions and Decrees of General Councils, and eſpecially that of* Trent, *do appoint; as alſo thoſe who*

præſertim Tridentini, ſtatuunt ; ac etiam eos qui poſt ipſorum ordinariorum ac etiam ab eis delegatorum quorumcunq; ſententias et decreta, aut alias fori eccleſiaſtici judicium eludentes, ad Cancellarias et alias Curias ſeculares recurrunt, et ab illis prohibitiones et mandata etiam pœnalia, ordinariis aut delegatis prædictis decerni, et contra illos exequi procurant ; eos quoq; qui hæc decernunt et exequuntur, ſeu dant auxilium, concilium, patrocinium & favorem in eiſdem.

after the ſentence and decrees of the Ordinaries themſelves, or of thoſe delegated by them, or by any other means eluding the judgment of the Eccleſiaſtical Court, have recourſe to Chanceries or other ſecular Courts, and procure thence Prohibitions and even Penal Mandates to be decreed againſt the ſaid Ordinaries and Delegates and executed againſt them ; alſo thoſe who make and execute theſe Decrees, or who give aid, counſel, countenance or favour to them.

§. 17. Quive juriſdictiones ſeu fructus, reditus & proventus ad nos & ſedem Apoſtolicam, & quaſcunque Eccleſiaſticas perſonas ratione Eccleſiarum, Monaſteriorum & aliorum beneficiorum Eccleſiaſticorum pertinentes uſurpant,

§ 17. *Alſo thoſe who uſurp any Juriſdictions, Fruits, Revenues, and Emoluments belonging to Us and the Apoſtolick See, and any Eccleſiaſtical perſons upon account of any Churches, Monaſteries, or other Eccleſiaſtical benefices ; or who upon any occaſion or cauſe ſ. que-*

vel etiam quavis occasione vel causa sine Romani Pontificis vel aliorum ad id legitimam facultatem habentium expressa licentia sequestrant.

§ 18. Quive collectas, decimas, talleas, præstantias & alia onera Clericis, Prælatis & aliis personis Ecclesiasticis, ac eorum & Ecclesiarum, Monasteriorum & aliorum beneficiorum Ecclesiasticorum bonis, illorumve fructibus, reditibus & proventibus hujusmodi, absque simili Romani Pontificis speciali & expressa licentia imponunt, & diversis etiam exquisitis modis exigunt, aut sic imposita a sponte dantibus & concedentibus recipiunt. Necnon qui per se vel alios directe vel indirecte prædicta facere, exequi vel procurare, aut in eisdem auxilium, consilium vel favorem præstare non verentur, cu-

ster the said Revenues without the express leave of the Bishop of Rome, *or others having lawful power to do it.*

§ 18. *Also those who without the like special and express licence of the Pope of* Rome *impose Tributes, Tenths, Talleys, Subsidies, and other Charges upon Clergy-men, Prelates, and other Ecclesiastical Persons, and the Goods, Fruits, Revenues and Emoluments of them and of the Churches, Monasteries, and other Ecclesiastical Benefices; and exact them by divers artifices, or even receive them so imposed from the Clergy, although they should of their own accord grant and give them: Also those who by themselves or others directly or indirectly fear not to do, execute or procure the said things, or to give aid, counsel or favour to them, of whatsoever preheminence, dignity, order,* juscunq;

juſcunq; ſint præeminentiæ, dignitatis, ordinis, conditionis aut ſtatus, etiamſi Imperiali aut Regali fulgeant dignitate; ſeu Principes, Duces, Comites, Barones, et alii Potentatus; quicunq; etiam Regnis, Provinciis, Civitatibus & Terris quoquomodo Præſidentes, conſiliarii & Senatores, aut quavis etiam Pontificali dignitate inſigniti. Innovantes decreta, ſuper his per Sacros Canones, tam in *Lateranenſi* noviſſime celebrato, quam aliis Conciliis generalibus edita, etiam cum cenſuris & pœnis in eis contentis.

condition or quality they be, although they be Emperors, or Kings, or Princes, Dukes, Earls, Barons, and other Potentates whatſoever, even Preſidents of Kingdoms, Provinces, Cities and Territories, Counſellers, and Senators, or inveſted even with any Pontifical Dignity. Renewing the Decrees ſet forth concerning theſe Matters by the Sacred Canons, as well in the laſt Council of Lateran, *as in other General Councils, together with the Cenſures and Puniſhments contained in them.*

§. 19. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & quoſcunq; Magiſtratus & Judices, Notarios, Scribas, Executores, Subexecutores quomodolibet ſe interponentes in cauſis capitalibus ſeu criminalibus contra

§ 19. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all and every Magiſtrates and Judges, Notaries, Scribes, Executors, Subexecutors, any ways intruding themſelves in capital or criminal cauſes againſt Eccleſiaſtical Perſons by proceſſing,*

Perſonas Eccleſiaſticas, illas proceſſando, banniendo, ſeu ſententias contra illas proferendo vel exequendo ſine ſpeciali, ſpecifica & expreſſa hujus Sanctæ Sedis Apoſtolicæ Licentia ; quique ejuſmodi licentiam ad Perſonas & caſus non expreſſos extendunt, vel alias illa perperam abutuntur, etiamſi talia committentes fuerint Conſiliarii, Senatores, Præſidentes, Cancellarii, Vicecancellarii, aut quovis alio nomine nuncupati.

baniſhing, or apprehending them, or pronouncing or executing any ſentences againſt them, without the ſpecial, particular and expreſs Licence of this Holy Apoſtolical See ; alſo thoſe who extend ſuch Licences to Perſons or Caſes not expreſſed, or any other way injuſtly abuſe them ; altho' the Offender ſhould be Counſellors, Senators, Preſidents, Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, or intitled by any other name.

§. 20. Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui per ſe ſeu alios, directe vel indirecte, ſub quocunq; titulo ſeu colore invadere, deſtruere, occupare et detinere præſumpſerint, in totum vel in partem Almam Urbem, Regnum *Siciliæ*, Inſulas *Sardiniæ* et *Corſicæ*, Terras circa *Pharum*, Patrimonium

§ 20. *Farther, We excommunicate and anathematize all thoſe, who by themſelves, or by others, directly or indirectly, under any Title or Colour whatſoever ſhall preſume to invade, deſtroy, ſeize, and detain, in whole or in part, the City of* Rome, *the Kingdom of* Sicily, *the Iſlands of* Sardinia *and* Corſica, *the Territories about* Faro, *St.* Peter's

B. *Petri* in *Tuſcia*, Ducatum *Spoletanum*, Comitatum *Venayſinum*, *Sabinenſem*, *Marchiæ*, *Anconitanæ*, *Maſſæ*, *Trebariæ*, *Romandiolæ*, *Campaniæ*, & Maritimas Provincias, illarumque Terras & loca, ac Terras ſpecialis commiſſionis *Arnulforum*, Civitateſq; noſtras *Bononiam*, *Cæſenam*, *Ariminum*, *Beneventum*, *Peruſium*, *Avenionem*, Civitatem *Caſtelli*, *Tudertum*, *Ferrarium*, *Comaclum*, & alias Civitates, Terras, & loca, vel jura ad ipſam *Romanam* Eccleſiam pertinentia, dictæque *Romanæ* Eccleſiæ mediate vel immediate ſubjecta, necnon ſupremam juriſdictionem in illis, Nobis & eidem *Romanæ* Eccleſiæ competentem, de facto uſurpare, perturbare, retinere & vexare variis modis præſumunt, nec non adhærentes, fautores, et defenſores eo-

Patrimony in Tuſcany, *the Dukedom of* Spoleto, *the County of* Venoſo, *and* Sabinum, Marca di Ancona, Maſſa, Trebaria, Romandiola, Campania, *and the Maritime Provinces, and their Territories and Places, and the Lands held in ſpecial commiſſion by the* Arnulfi, *and our Cities of* Bononia, Cæſena, Ariminum, Beneventum, Peruſium, Avignon, Citta di Caſtello, Todi, Ferrara, Comaclo, *and other Cities, Lands and Places and Rights belonging to the Church of* Rome, *and ſubjected mediately or immediately to the ſaid Church of* Rome; *alſo thoſe who preſume by divers means to uſurp, diſturb, detain, and vex the ſupreme Juriſdiction to the ſaid Dominions belonging to Us and the Church of* Rome; *alſo their Adherents, Favour-*

rum, ſeu illis auxilium conſilium, vel favorem quomodolibet præſtantes.

§ 21. Volentes præſentes noſtros Proceſſus, ac omnia et quæcunq; his literis contenta, quouſque alii hujuſmodi proceſſus a Nobis aut *Romano* Pontifice pro tempore exiſtente ſiant aut publicentur, durare, ſuoſq; effectus omnino ſortiri.

§ 22. Cæterum a prædictis ſententiis nullus per alium quam per *Romanum* Pontificem, niſi in mortis articulo conſtitutus, nec etiam tunc, niſi de ſtando Eccleſiæ mandatis et ſatisfaciendo cautione præſtita, abſolvi poſſit, etiam prætextu quarumvis facultatum et indultorum quibuſcunque perſonis Eccleſiaſticis, ſecularibus, et quorumvis Ordinum, etiam Mendicantium et Militarium, regularibus,

ers and Defenders, or thoſe who any way give aſſiſtance, counſel or favour to them.

§ 21 *Willing that our preſent proceſſes, and all and every thing contained in theſe Letters, continue in force, and be put in execution; till other Proceſſes of this kind be made and publiſhed by Us and the Pope of* Rome *for the time being.*

§ 22. *In fine, none may be abſolved from the aforeſaid Cenſures by any other than by the Pope of* Rome, *unleſs he be at the point of death, nor even then, unleſs he giveth caution to ſtand to the commands of the Church, and give ſatisfaction. In all other caſes none ſhall be abſolved, not even under pretence of any Faculties or Indulgences granted and renewed by Us and the ſaid See, and the Decrees of any Council, by Words, Letters, or any*

etiam

etiam Episcopali vel alia majori dignitate præditis, ipsisque ordinibus & eorum Monasteriis, Conventibus, & Domibus ac Capitulis, Collegiis, Confraternitatibus, Congregationibus, Hospitalibus, et locis piis, necnon Laicis, etiamsi Imperiali, Regali, et alia, mundana excellentia fulgentibus, per Nos et dictam Sedem ac cujusvis Concilii decreta, verbo, literis, aut alia quacunque Scriptura in genere et in specie concessorum et innovatorum, ac concedendorum et innovandorum.

other Writing, in general or in particular, to any Persons Ecclesiastical, Secular, and Regular of any Orders, even of the Mendicant and Military Orders, or to any Persons invested with Episcopal, or any greater Dignity, and to Orders themselves and their Monasteries, Convents, Houses and Chapters, to Colleges, Confraternities, Congregations, Hospitals, and Pious Places, as also to Laymen, although they should be Emperors, Kings, or eminent in any other secular Dignity.

§ 23. Quod si forte aliqui contra tenorem præsentium talibus excommunicatione et anathemate laqueatis, vel illorum alicui absolutionis beneficium impendere de facto præsumpserint, eos excommunicationis sententia innodamus, gravius

§ 23. *If by chance any shall against the tenor of these Presents,* de facto, *presume to bestow the benefit of Absolution upon any such involved in excommunication, and anathema, or any of them; we include them in the Sentence of Excommunication, and*

contra eos ſpiritualiter et temporaliter, prout expedire noverimus proceſſuri.

ſhall afterwaads proceed more ſeverely againſt them both by ſpiritual and temporal Puniſhments, as we ſhall think moſt convenient.

§ 24. Declarantes ac proteſtantes quamcunque abſolutionem, etiamſi ſolennitur per Nos faciendam, prædictos excommunicatos ſub præſentibus comprehenſos, niſi prius a præmiſſis cum vero propoſito ſimilia ulterius non committendi, deſtiterint, ac quoad eos, qui contra eccleſiaſticam libertatem, ut præmittitur, ſtatuta fecerint, niſi prius ſtatuta, ordinationes, conſtitutiones, pragmaticas, et decreta hujuſmodi publice revocaverint, et ex Archivis ſeu Capitularibus, locis aut libris, in quibus annotata reperiuntur, deleri et caſſari, ac Nos de revocatione hujuſmodi certiores fecerint, eos non compre-

§ 24. *Declaring and proteſting that no Abſolution, altho' ſolemnly made by Us, ſhall comprehend, or any other way avail the aforeſaid excommunicated Perſons comprehended under theſe preſent Letters; unleſs they deſiſt from the premiſſes with a firm purpoſe of never committing the like thing; nor thoſe, who, as was before ſaid, have made Statutes againſt the Eccleſiaſtical Liberty; unleſs they firſt publickly revoke theſe Statutes, Orders, Conſtitutions, Pragmaticks and Decrees, and cauſe them to be blotted and expunged out of the Archieves, Rolls, and Regiſters wherein they are preſerved, and farther certify Us of this revocation: moreover, that by any ſuch Abſolution, or*

hendere

hendere, nec eis aliter ſuffragari ; quinetiam per hujuſmodi abſolutionem, aut quoſcunque alios actus contrarios tacitos vel expreſſos, ac etiam per patientiam et tolerantiam noſtram vel Succeſſorum noſtrorum, quantocunq; tempore continuatam, præmiſſis omnibus et ſingulis, ac quibuſcunque juribus Sedis Apoſtolicæ ac Sanctæ *Romanæ* Eccleſiæ undecunq; et quandocunq; quæſitis, vel quærendis nullatenus præjudicari poſſe aut debere.

any other contrary Acts, tacite or expreſs, or even by the connivance and toleration of Us and our Succeſſors for how long time ſoever continued, none nor any of the Premiſſes, nor any Right of the Apoſtolick See and Holy Church of Rome *howſoever and whenſoever obtained, or to be obtained, can or ought to be prejudged or receive any prejudice.*

§ 25. Non obſtantibus privilegiis, indulgentiis, indultis, et literis Apoſtolicis generalibus vel ſpecialibus ſupradictis vel eorum, alicui, ſeu aliquibus aliis cujuſcunq; ordinis, ſtatus vel conditionis, dignitatis et præeminentiæ fuerint, etiamſi, ut præmittitur, Pontificali, Imperiali, Rega-

§ 25. *Notwithſtanding any Privileges, Indulgences, Grants, and Apoſtolick Letters general or ſpecial, granted by the Holy See to any of the aforeſaid Perſons, or any one of them, or any others, of whatſoever order, quality or condition, dignity, and preheminence they be ; although, as was before ſaid, they ſhould be Biſh-*

li,

li, seu quavis Ecclesiastica et mundana præfulgeant dignitate, vel eorum Regnis, Provinciis, civitatibus seu locis a prædicta Sede ex quavis causa etiam per viam contractus aut remunerationis, et sub quavis alia forma et tenore, ac cum quibusvis clausulis, etiam derogatoriarum derogatoriis concessis, etiam continentibus quod excommunicari, anathematizari vel interdici non possint, per literas Apostolicas non facientes plenam et expressam ac de verbo ad verbum de indulto hujusmodi, ac de ordinibus, locis nominibus propriis, cognominibus et dignitatibus eorum mentionem necnon consuetudinibus, etiam immemorabilibus, ac præscriptionibus quantumcunq; longissimis, et aliis quibuslibet observantiis scriptis vel

ops, Emperors, Kings, eminent in any other Ecclesiastick or Secular Dignity, or to their Kingdoms, Provinces, Cities, and Dominions, for any cause whatsoever, even by way of contract or reward, and under any other form and tenor, and with any Clauses whatsoever, even derogatory of those which should derogate from them, or even containing that the said Persons or Places shall not be excommunicated, anathematized or interdicted by any Apostolick Letters, which do not make full and express mention and exact repetition of the said Grant, and of the Orders, Places, Proper names, Sirnames and Dignities of the said Persons: as also notwithstanding all Customs, even immemorial, and prescriptions how long soever, and any other Observances written or not written, by which the said Per-

non

non ſcriptis, per quæ contra hos noſtros Proceſſus ac ſententias, quo minus includantur in eis, ſe juvare valeant ac tueri. Quæ omnia quoad hoc, eorum omnium tenores, ac ſi ad verbum, nihil penitus omiſſo, inſerentur, præſentibus pro expreſſis habentes penitus tollimus, & omnino revocamus : cæteriſque contrariis quibuſcunque.

ſons may help and defend themſelves againſt theſe our Proceſſes and Cenſures from being included in them. All which Grants, as far as relates to this matter, and the whole tenor of them, accounting them expreſſed in theſe Preſents as if they had been verbatim inſerted, nothing omitted, we utterly aboliſh and wholly revoke ; and notwithſtanding any other Pleas which may be alledged to the contrary.

§ 26. Ut vero præſentes noſtri proceſſus ad publicam omnium notitiam facilius deducantur, Chartas ſeu Membranas Proceſſus ipſos continentes, valvis Eccleſiæ S. *Joannis Lateranenſis*, & *Baſilicæ*, Principis Apoſtolorum de Urbe appendi faciemus, ut ii, quos Proceſſus hujuſmodi concernunt, quod ad ipſos non pervenerint, aut quod ipſos ignorave-

§ 26. *But that theſe our preſent Proceſſes may more eaſily come to the knowledge of all Perſons ; We have cauſed the Papers and Parchments containing the Proceſſes themſelves to be affixed in the City to the doors of the Church of S.* John Lateran, *and of the Church of the Prince of the Apoſtles ; that thoſe whom theſe Proceſſes concern, may pretend no excuſe or alledge ignorance, as if they had*

rint

rint, nullam poſſint excuſationem pretendere aut ignorantiam allegare ; cum non ſi veriſimile,id remanere incognitum, quod tam patenter omnibus publicatur.

§ 27. Inſuper ut Proceſſus ipſi & præſentes literæ, ac omnia & ſingula in eis contenta, eo fiant notiora,quo in pleriſq; Civitatibus & locis fuerint publicata ; univerſis & ſingulis Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiſcopis, Epiſcopis, & locorum Ordinariis, & Prælatis ubilibet conſtitutis, per hæc ſcripta,committimus & in vertute ſanctæ obedientiæ diſtricte præcipiendo mandamus ; ut per ſe vel per alium ſeu alios præſentes literas, poſtquam eas receperint, ſeu earum habuerint notitiam, ſemel in anno, aut, ſi expedire viderint, etiam pluries, in Eccleſiis ſuis, dum

not come to their knowledge ; ſince it is not probable, that ſhould remain unknown, which is ſo openly publiſhed to all Men.

§ 27. *Moreover, that the Proceſſes themſelves, and theſe preſent Letters, and all and every thing contained in them may become more manifeſt by being publiſhed in many Cities and Places ; We by theſe Writings intruſt, and in vertue of holy obedience ſtrictly charge and command all and ſingular Patriarchs, Primates, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Ordinaries of Places, and Prelates whereſoever conſtituted, that by themſelves or ſome other or others, after they ſhall have received, theſe preſent Letters, or have knowledge of them, they ſolemnly publiſh them in their Churches once a year or oftner, if they ſee conve-*

in

in eis major populi multitudo ad Divina convenerit, ſolenniter publicent, & ad Chriſti fidelium mentes reducant, nuncient, & declarent.

§ 28. Cæterum Patriarchæ, Archiepiſcopi, Epiſcopi, aliique locorum Ordinarii, & Eccleſiarum Præliti, necnon Rectores, cæterique curam animarum exercentes, ac Presbyteri ſæculares et quorumvis Ordinum regulares, ad audiendas peccatorum confeſſiones quavis authoritate deputati, tranſumptum præſentium Literarum penes ſe habeant, eaſq; diligenter legere & percipere ſtudeant.

§ 29. Volentes earundum præſentium tranſumptis etiam impreſſis, Notarii publici manu ſubſcriptis, & ſigillo Judicis Ordinarii Romanæ Curiæ, vel alterius perſonæ in

nient, when the greater part of the People ſhall be met for celebration of Divine Service ; put faithful Chriſtians in mind of them, relate them, and declare them.

§ 28. *Laſtly, all Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and other Ordinaries of Places, and Prelates of Churches, as alſo all Rectors, and others having cure of Souls, and Prieſts ſecular and regular of whatſoever Orders, deputed by any authority to hear confeſſion of ſins, ſhall have a Tranſcript of theſe preſent Letters by them, and ſhall diligently ſtudy to read and underſtand them.*

§ 29. *Our farther pleaſure is, that the ſame credit in judgment and out of judgment, ſhall in all places be given to Copies, although Printed, of theſe preſents, ſubſcribed by any publick Notary,*

dignitate

dignitate eccleſiaſtica conſtitutæ munitis, eandem prorſus fidem in judicio, & extra illud ubiq; locorum adhibendam fore, quæ ipſis præſentibus adhiberetur, ſi eſſent exhibitæ vel oſtenſæ.

§ 30. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam noſtræ excommunicationis, anathematizationis, interdicti, innovationis, innodationis, declarationis, proteſtationis, ſublationis, revocationis, commiſſionis, mandati & voluntatis infringere, vel ei auſu temerario contraire. Siquis autem hoc attentare præſumpſerit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei ac Beatorum *Petri* & *Pauli* Apoſtolorum ejus ſe noverit incurſurum.

Datum *Romæ* apud S. *Petrum*, Anno Incarnationis Dominicæ Milleſſimo ſexcenteſimo decimo, ſexto Idus

and ſealed by the ordinary Judge of the Court of Rome, *or any other perſon in Eccleſiaſtical dignity; as would be given to theſe preſents themſelves, if they ſhould be produced or ſhewn.*

§ 30 *Let no man therefore infringe, or boldly and raſhly oppoſe this our Letter of Excommunication, Anathematization, Interdict, Innovation, Innodation, Declaration, Proteſtation, Abolition, Revocation, Commiſſion, Command and Pleaſure: But if any one ſhall preſume to attempt it; let him know that he ſhall incur the diſpleaſure of Almighty God, and of his Bleſſed Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul.

Given at Rome *from St.* Peter, *in the year of our Lord's Incarnation, One thouſand, ſix huudred and ten, the eighth of Aprilis,*

Aprilis, Pontificatus noſtri anno quinto.

Anno a Nativitate Domini noſtri *Jeſu Chriſti* milleſſimo ſexcenteſimo decimo tertio, Indict. 11. die vero quarta menſis *Aprilis*, Pontificatus Sanctiſſ. in *Chriſto* Patris & D.N.D. *Pauli* divina providentia Papæ V. anno octavo, ſupradictæ literæ affixæ & publicatæ fuerunt ad Valvas Baſilicarum S. *Joannis Lateranenſis* & Principis Apoſtolorum, & in acie Campi *Floræ* per nos *Baldaſſarem Vacham* & *Brandimartem Latinum* Curſores.

April, *in the fifth year of our Popedom.*

In the year, from the birth of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt 1613. *Indict.* 11. *the 4th day of the Month* April, *and the eighth year of the Popedom of our moſt Holy Father in* Chriſt, *and our Lord* Paul V. *by Divine Providence Pope, the aforeſaid Letters were affixed and publiſhed at the Doors of the Churches of St.* John Lateran, *and the Prince of the Apoſtles, and in the field of* Flora, *by us* Balthazar Vacha *and* Brandimars Latini *Curſors.*

Jacobus Brambrilla.
Mag. Curſ.

James Brambrilla.
Mag. Curſ.

FINIS.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE Parliament OF PARIS, UPON THE POPE'S BULL,

Concerning the Franchises in the City of *Rome*, and the following Ordonance of the *26th* of *December*, 1687.

France. Parlement (Paris)

Translated into *English* by Order of his Excellency *Monsieur Barillon*, his Most Christian Majesties Ambassadour Extraordinary to the King of *Great Britain*.

LONDON

Printed for *R. Bentley*, and are to be Sold by *Randal Taylor*, near Stationers-Hall. 1688.

An Extract out of the Registers of the Parliament of *Paris*.

THIS Day the Parliament of *Paris* being assembled, the King's Council appearing, Mr. *Denys Talon*, His Majesties Advocate-General made this following Speech, That among the rest of the Court of *Rome*'s Attempts upon several Occasions, in prejudice of the Liberties of the Church of *France*, and of the Rights and Preheminencies of the Crown; there has been nothing observ'd in the History of late Ages, parallell to what was done in the Month of *December* last, and which is nothing more but what the Pope has been contriving many Years, in declaring himself an Enemy of *France*, &c.—

In the Assembly held upon Occasion of the Affairs of the *Regalia*, the Bishops being inform'd that the *Italian* Doctors, and the Emissaries of the Court of *Rome*, omitted not any means to spread about the Kingdom, the *new Opinions* of the Popes Infallibility, and the indirect Power which *Rome* strives to usurp over the Temporality of Kings; that Assembly, We say, did not pretend to frame a Decision of a doubtful Controversie; but give a Publick and Authentick Testimony of a certain Truth, taught by all the Fathers of the Church, and determined by all the Councils, and especially by those of *Constance* and *Basile*. And it's well known

known that the Cardinal of *Lorrain* assisting at the Council of *Trent*, publickly declared that the Faculty of Divinity at *Paris*, the Universities of the Kingdom, and in a word, all *France* was perswaded, that the Pope, far from being Infallible, ought to submit to the Decisions of Councils, and it does not appear that this Assertion, made him incurr any Reproach from the Court of *Rome*.

Yet has the World with amazement seen, that the Pope lookt upon this Declaration as an injury done to his Authority; insomuch, that the King having nominated to the Episcopacy, some of those that assisted at that Assembly; and who are as well recommendable for their Piety and Virtue, as for their Knowledge and Learning; Bulls were refused them, on pretence that they do not make Profession of a sound Doctrine.

If this foundation is solid, we are like to have no more Bishops for the future: Since all the Ecclesiasticks of the Kingdom, and particularly those that in the Universities take the necessary Degrees to attain to Prelacies, with an invincible steddiness maintain the Propositions which the Pope complains of.

Tho' this refusal has not the least glimmering of Reason, yet does it nevertheless, raise a very great Scandal, and produce Disorders, beyond expression. And indeed, the Pope's Obstinacy is the Cause, that thirty five Cathedral Churches remain destitute of Pastors, and this in a time when a vast number of newly

Converted Perſons ſtand in need of Inſtruction, for their being fortified and confirmed in the Orthodox Belief, and when the Preſence of the Biſhops is very neceſſary in their Dioceſſes.

Who could ever imagine that the Pope, who is propoſed to us as an Image of Holineſs and Virtue, ſhould remain ſo wedded to his Opinions, and ſo jealous of the ſhadow of an Imaginary Authority, that he ſhould leave the third part of the Churches of *France* Vacant becauſe We will not own him to be Infallible!

Theſe that inſpire theſe thoughts into the Pope, can they fancy they ſhall make us change our Opinions? And are they ſo blind, as not to know that thoſe Unhappy times are paſt, when a groſs ignorance joined to a Faintneſs in the Government, and falſe Prepoſſeſſions, rendred the Pope's Decrees ſo very dreadful, however unjuſt they might be; and that thoſe Diſputes and Quarrels, far from augmenting their Power, do only ſerve to cauſe enquiry to be made into the Origine of their Uſurpations, and leſſen the Veneration of the People rather than encreaſe it? *&c.*——

And to give ſome colour to ſo ſcandalous an Innovation, he refers to that famous Bull, ſtil'd *in Cæna Domini*, becauſe it is read at *Rome* every *Thurſday* of the Holy Week. True it is, that if this Decree, whereby the Popes Declare themſelves Soveraign Monarchs of the World, be legitimate; the Majeſty Royal will then depend on their humour, all our Liberties

will

will be aboliſh'd, the Secular Judges will no longer have the Power to try the Poſſeſſion of Beneficies, nor the Civil and Criminal Cauſes of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons; and we ſhall quickly ſee our ſelves brought under the yoke of the Inquiſition.

Thus, however unjuſt and abuſive this new Decree may be, it is much leſs dangerous by the frivolous Menaces it contains, than by its being built upon a Title altogether void and vicious; and that in this Conjuncture, it looks as if *Rome* would at preſent follow the ſteps of *Julius* the 2d. renew his Animoſity and Rage againſt *France*, without making reflection how odious his Memory is in the Chriſtian Common-wealth.

When Pope *Gregory* the 4th meaning to render himſelf Arbitrator of the Diſpute that aroſe between *Lewis* the *Debonnair* and his Children, threatned the Biſhops of *France* to Excommunicate them if they did not cloſe with his Deſigns: Thoſe Prelates being ſurprized at a Procedure ſo contrary to the Canons, couragiouſly anſwer'd, That *they would not obey the Pope's Will*; *and that if he come with a deſign to Excommunicate them, he ſhould himſelf return Excommunicated: Si Excommunicaturus veniret, Excommunicatus abiret*; as if they meant to ſay, That he, who without lawful Cauſe, and through humane Motives, undertakes to ſuſpend one of the Members of *Jeſus Chriſt* from the Communion of the Church, does ſeperate himſelf from it by ſuch an unjuſt attempt.

Let us further urge, that the ill uſe which the Popes have in ſo many Occaſions made of the Authority with which they are entruſted in giving it no other Bounds than thoſe of their own will, has been the ſource of almoſt all the incurable Miſchiefs, with which the Church is afflicted, and the moſt ſpecious Pretences of the Hereticks and Schiſmaticks that the laſt Age produc'd, ſo as the Divines aſſembled by Pope *Paul* the Third's Order, did ſincerely own; and beſides at preſent, the bare Idea of the Infallibility, and indirect Power which the Complaiſance of the *Italian* Doctor does Attribute to the See of *Rome*, upon the Temporality of Princes, is one of the greateſt Obſtacles that oppoſe the Converſion, not only of individual Perſons, but of whole Provinces; and Peoples minds cannot be too thoroughly convinc'd that theſe new Opinions do not make part of the Doctrine of the Univerſal Church *&c.*——

If he had been an Envoy from the Emperour of the *Turks*, from the King of *Perſia*, or ſome other Infidel Prince, he would not have been ſo rigorouſly us'd. Is it that the Pope means to have no more Commerce with *France*? Is he perſuaded that his Power reaches no farther than the Dioceſs of *Rome*, and his Partriarchſhip than the Neighbouring Provinces, ſtiled Suburbicarial? Does he intend to renounce the Quality of *Head of the Church*, and *Common Father of the Faithful*? *&c.*——

And in this occaſion the Thunders of the *Vaticum* have nothing formidable; they are

Tranſitory

Tranſitory Fires, that exhale into ſmoak, and which do neither hurt nor prejudice, ſave to thoſe who darted them.

And tho' this Bull be neither publiſh'd nor executed in the Kingdom, it is not the leſs abuſive. We do not doubt, but that a more moderate Pope, reflecting upon the diſorders which ſuch an Innovation is capable of producing, would imitate the Example of *Clement* the Fifth, who, by a ſolemn Decree, did for ever aboliſh the memory of what his Predeceſſor *Boniface* the Eight had unjuſtly undertaken againſt King *Philip* the Fair; And this Retractation, which proves that the Popes are not Infallible, ſince the one deſtroys what the other had built; among others, revokes the Bull, *Unam Sanctam*; wherein *Boniface*, whoſe proud Conduct was blamed by the whole Church, declares that the Sword of Soveraigns is ſubjected to the Popes Spiritual Faulchion, *&c.*——

If then we put in an Appeal to the future Council againſt the Cenſures contain'd in the Bull, and againſt the Interdict that is a Conſequence and acceſſary of it; it is becauſe that not only the Deciſions of Popes, but their very Perſon, when they fail in their Duty in the Government of the Church, is to ſubmit to the Correction and Reformation of the General Council, in what regards as well Faith as Diſcipline. An indiſputable Truth whence We ſhall never depart, whatever endeavours the Partizans of the Court of *Rome* may uſe.

The Pope's denying to grant Bulls to all the Biſhops nominated by the King, occaſions a Diſorder that daily augments, and which requires a ſpeedy and efficacious Remedy. The Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* having endeavoured to contrive ſome moderation to the Court of *Rome's* Uſurpations, and to the Confuſion that was introduced in the diſtribution of Benefices, the pragmatick Sanction was afterwards compos'd of the Decrees of thoſe Councils. But the Popes thereby perceiving their Authority to diminiſh, made uſe of all ſorts of Artifices to aboliſh it; and by the Concordate made between King *Francis* the 1*ſt.* and by Pope *Leo* the 10*th*, they regulated the manner of diſpoſing of Biſhopricks and Abbies: To the Pope was granted not only the devolution, but alſo the prevention and the power of admitting the Reſignations in favour, and many other Articles that are very burdenſome to the ordinary Collaters, and abſolutely contrary to the Ancient Canons.

And indeed our Fore fathers did for a long while complain againſt the *Concordate.* The Ordinance of *Orleans* did re-eſtabliſh the Elections; and it would be very advantageous that all Eccleſiaſtical Matters were tranſacted in the Kingdom, without ever being obliged to have recourſe to *Rome.* In the ſequel nevertheleſs the *Concordate* was ſincerely executed on our part; and it is inconceiveable that the *Pope* ſhould now, through an invincible Obſtinacy, reduce us to deprive him of the profit,

which

which the Court of *Rome* derives from a Treaty, which is so much to its advantage.

The King is most Religious, in nominating to the Prelacies Ecclesiasticks of an exemplary Integrity, and of conspicuous merit; and because that these Ecclesiasticks do not believe that the *Pope* is *INFALLIBLE*; that they do not like the *Italian* Doctors, attribute to him the Title of *Universal Monarch*; that they are persuaded He has no power, either direct or indirect, over the Temporality of Kings, and that He is to all intents inferiour to the Councils, that have a right to Correct him, and to Reform His Decisions. The *Pope* upon this imaginary pretence, refuses them *BULLS*, and leaves the third part of the Churches of the Kingdom destitute of *Pastors*. Is this imitating the Care and Lenity of the Apostles in the Government of the Church?

After all, before the *Concordate*, those that were Elected by the Clergy and the people, and afterwards by the Chapters, in presence of one of the Kings Commissioners: Were they not Ordained by the *Metropolitan*, assisted by the Bishops of the Province, after that the King had approved of their Election? The Right acquired to the King by the *Concordate*, being Authorized in this respect by the Tacit consent of the whole *Gallian Church*, and confirmed by a possession of near two Centuries, ought so much the less to receive any Change and Invasion, that during the first four Ages of the Monarchy, they went not to *Rome* to demand Institution and Induction of Benefices:

ces: The Biſhops Diſpos'd of all thoſe that were vacant in their Dioceſſes; and our Kings did almoſt ever nominate to the Biſhopricks; and as they ſometimes granted the Clergy and the people the liberty of Electing a Paſtor; they often reſerv'd the choice of him to themſelves; he they had choſen was immediately Conſecrated, without the Popes intermedling in the Matter. Who hinders us from following theſe Examples, grounded upon this excellent Reaſon, That the Right, which all the Faithful had in the beginning of appointing themſelves a Head; being no longer to be exerciſed in common, ought to paſs into the Power of the Soveraign, on whom the Subjects rely for the Government of the State; of which the Church is the nobleſt part.

But as to the *Pope*, ſince He refuſes to join the Concourſe of His Authority to the Kings Nomination: We may preſume, that He means to diſcharge Himſelf of the painful burden which overwhelms Him; and that His Infirmities not permitting Him to extend His Paſtoral Diligence over all the parts of the *Univerſal Church*; the Devolution that is made in caſe of negligence, ſometimes even from the Superiour to the Inferiour, may Authorize the Biſhops to lay their Hands on thoſe that ſhall be Nominated by the King to the Prelacies; His Nomination having as much, or more effect, than the Election of the people and the Clergy, which ought, without difficulty, to

be

be Confirmed by the Immediate Superiour; when an unworthy perſon was not choſen.

And if the like reſolution requires the being accompanied with ſome temperament; If it requires the Biſhops Concurrence: The King may be beſought to convene the Provincial Councils, or if need be, a National Council; therein to take Reſolutions ſuitable to the Occaſions of the *Gallican* Church.

And as the Evil ſeems urgent, and that there would be poſſibly ſome danger in venturing upon the delays that are inſeparable to the holding of a National Council, His Majeſty may aſſemble ſuch as he pleaſes of the principal Officers, of the Biſhops, and conſiderable Perſons of all the Orders of his Realm, to take their advice in ſo important an Affair.

But it is not juſt, that while that the *Pope* refuſes to Execute the *Concordate* in one of its principal Articles, he does, nevertheleſs, enjoy the Advantages that are granted him by that Treaty, which contains Conventions reciprocally obligatory; that people continue to go to *Rome*, and thither carry Money, for the obtaining either the Inſtitutions of Benefices or Diſpenſations, that may be eaſily expediated in the Kingdom.

Now if we purpoſe to break off this Traffick, it is only becauſe it ceaſes to be reciprocal; and Becauſe that the Pope by his Obſtinacy, interpoſing an invincible impediment to the Expedition of the Bulls of a great number of Biſhopricks. It would be a ſhame to ſuffer

ſuffer that the *Gallican* Church ſhould remain burden'd with the Yoke of Prevention of Reſignations in favour, and of all the other Servitudes whereunto *France* was content to ſubmit by the *Concordate*.

And herein We do but faintly repel the Injury that is done Us: We oppoſe the Buckler of our Liberties againſt a New and Un-exampled Enterprize. Calamity and Anathema, to thoſe that out of Intereſt or Caprice, diſturb the Correſpondence that ought to be between the Prieſthood and the Royalty, Who ſeem to have no other Aim than to raiſe a Schiſm in the Church, and by fatal Diviſions diſturb the Peace which all *Europe* enjoys, and which was procured It by the Valour and Wiſdom of our Invincible Monarch.

But whatever endeavours thoſe factious Spirits may uſe that poſſeſs the Pope and abuſe the power which his great Age and Infirmities oblige him to give them in the Government of the Church, We ſhall ever remain inſperably united to the Holy See, We will acknowledge Saint *Peter*'s Succeſſor as the firſt and the chief of the Biſhops, We will moſt Religiouſly maintain the Communion and Correſpondence with the Church of *Rome*, and we will defend our ſelves with as much moderation as vigour againſt the Inſults, Invaſions, and Innovations contrary to the King's Rights, to the Dignity of his Crown, to the Decrees of the Councils, to the General Policy of our Church and to our Liberties.

All theſe Reaſons, and a world of others which we omit, oblige us to require that it would pleaſe the Court to admit Us as appealing againſt the Abuſe of the Bull, dated in the Month of *May* laſt, and of the Ordinance given in purſuance thereof: And upon our Appeal, to declare the ſaid *Bull* and *Ordinance* void and abuſive; making Prohibition to all Perſons, of vending them in the Kingdom, on pain of being proceeded againſt according to the ſeverity of the Law; enjoyning all thoſe that have Copies of them, to bring them to the Regiſter of the Court, in order to their being ſuppreſſed: As likewiſe, to order that the Act of Appeal, made by the Attorney General to the future Council, be Regiſtred in the Regiſter of the Court: That the King ſhall be moſt humbly beſought to employ his Authority for the maintaining of the Franchiſes, and the Immunity of the Quarter of his Ambaſſadours at *Rome*, in the whole Extent that they have hitherto had: Moreover that His Majeſty may be humbly deſired to order the holding of Provincial Councils, nay and of a National Council, if need be, or the Aſſembly of the Nobles of his Realm; and after having heard their advice to chooſe the means he ſhall reckon moſt fitting, for the hindring the Diſorders which the vacancy of ſo many Arch-biſhopricks and Biſhopricks in the Kingdom do produce, and prevent the Increaſe and Progreſs of ſo dangerous an Evil. We further require that the King be alſo moſt humbly beſought

to

to forbid his Subjects to have any Commerce in the mean while with *Rome*, and of sending any Money thither, and in this to interpose his Authority as far as he shall judge convenient, and that it be ordered by the Court that the Arrest that shall intervene upon our present Conclusions, shall be affix't in the publick Places, and every where as shall be needful in the wonted manner.

The King's Council being withdrawn, a Copy being perus'd, Printed at *Rome* of a *Bull* concerning the *Franchises* of the Quarters of the said Town, and of the following Ordinance of *December 26.* last, together with the Act of Appeal put into the future Council by the King's Attorney General the 28th of this Month, and the Conclusions by him taken in writing, the Matter being brought under Debate.

The Attorney General's appealing from the abuse of the said Bull, and of the following Ordinance on the *26th* of *November* last, the Court admitted of the said Appeal, and declares the said Bull and Ordinance as null and abusive; Prohibits all Persons whatsoever to vend them in the Kingdom, on pain of being proceeded against according to the severity of the Law; enjoining those that have Copies of them to bring them to the Register of the Court, there to be suppressed; orders that the Act of Appeal put in by the King's Attorney General to the future Council, shall be registred in the Register of the Court, and that the King shall be most humbly desired to em-

ploy

ploy his Authority for the maintaining the Franchiſes and Immunities of the Quarter of his Ambaſſadors in the Court of *Rome*, in the whole extent they have hitherto had, to order the holding of Provincial Councils, or even of a National Council, or an Aſſembly of the Nobles of His Kingdom, ſo to adviſe about the moſt ſuitable Means for the Remedying the Diſorders which the long Vacancy of ſeveral Archbiſhopricks and Biſhopricks, has therein introduced, and to prevent the progreſs and encreaſe of them, and in the mean while to forbid his Subjects in ſuch manner as the ſaid Lord the King ſhall judge convenient to have any Commerce, or remit any Money into the Court of *Rome*. And this preſent Arreſt to be affix'd in the public and uſual Places of this Town, and every where as ſhall be needful. Done in Parliament on the 23*d*. of *Jan*. 1688.

Sign'd *Jacques*.

Act of the Appeal put in by the Attorney General to the Council upon the Subject of the Pope's *Bull concerning the Franchiſes in the City of* Rome, *and of the following Ordonance on the* 26th. *of* December *laſt*.

BEfore the underwritten Apoſtolical Notary was preſent in his own Perſon, *Meſſire Achilles de Harlay*, Councellor of the King in his Council of State, and his Majeſties Attorney General, who in the Preſence, and by the Advice

vice and Council of *Meſſire Denis Talon* and of *Meſſire Francois Criteau de la Moignon* alſo, Counſellors of the King in his Council of State, and his Advocates General in his Court of Parliament, has declared that having ſome time ſince ſeen Copies of a Bull given on the 12*th.* of *May* laſt paſt, by our Holy Father Pope *Innocent* the 11*th*, concerning the Franchiſes which certain Perſons are in Poſſeſſion of enjoying in the City of *Rome*, he could not have imagined that his Holineſs could have conceived the deſign of comprehending the Ambaſſadors which the King was willing to ſend to him, in the general Menaces of Excommunication which he judg'd convenient to inſert therein, contrary to the Uſe obſerved by other Popes in the Bulls made by them; he had hoped that if the Remembrance of the Sovereign Power which the Kings, his Majeſty's Predeceſſors exerciſed in *Rome* of their Liberalities to the Holy See, and of the Protection they gave to ſeveral Popes, could not induce this Pope to cauſe to be rendred to the King in the Perſons of his Miniſters, Honours and Teſtimonies of Acknowledgment proportionable to his Bounties, at leaſt his Holineſs as viſible Head of the Church, would not be inſenſible to the Prodigies which the King had perform'd before his Eyes for the re-uniting in the Boſom of this good Mother ſo vaſt a number of Children that were gone aſtray from her, that he would be affected with the Piety of this Prince, and the powerful Protection he continually gives

to

to Prelates, tho' he was not with his Victories and Power; and that he would not enter into diſpute with him about Rights that had not ſuffered any Invaſion, even for ſeveral years under his Popedom.

But being informed that his Holineſs had given order to the Cardinal that is his Vicar in *Rome*, to declare the Church of St. *Lewis* of the ſaid City, and the Eccleſiaſtics that officiate in it, interdicted for having admitted to the participation of the holy Myſteries and Sacraments on the Night wherein is celebrated the Solemnity of our Lords Nativity; *Monſieur le Marquis de Lavardin* the Kings Ambaſſador extraordinary to his Holineſs, and that it was ſuppoſed by the Ordonance delivered upon this Subject, that he was notoriouſly Excommunicated for pretended Contraventions to this Bull, the ſaid Attorney General did not think that he could without being wanting to his Duty, remain any longer in the Silence he had hitherto kept.

Now if the Matter which has given an occaſion to ſo great an Exceſs, did concern the Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction which belongs to the Pope, he would eaſily ſhew the Errors that have been committed by proceeding againſt a Perſon that has not been particularly ſpecified in that Bull, to whom the State of Matters has not been ſignified ſince his being at *Rome*, who might be ignorant of them in *France*, where it was not publiſht, that the Pope could not condemn him as an Ambaſſador tho' his Character

ought to ſecure him from thoſe Thunders, in regard of his Functions, yet His Holineſs would not ſo much as hear or own him in that Quality, whatever Addreſſes he has caus'd to be made for that purpoſe, and that in fine, the very Rules of the Canon Law requires that Perſons of ſo eminent a Dignity, as is that of his, ſhould be pointed out by Name in Bulls of that Nature, before they can incur the Penalties they utter.

But that the Pope in a Matter purely Temporal, as are theſe Franchiſes of the Kings Ambaſſadors, having made uſe of the Spiritual Arms, which he is only entruſted withal for the Conduct and Edification of the Church, and having conſtituted himſelf Judge in his own Cauſe, the Excommunication which his Holineſs's Cardinal Vicar declares to have been incurr'd, is ſo null, that there is no occaſion for any Proceedings to annihilate it, and thoſe that are therein comprehended, ought not to receive Abſolution, though it were even offered them at their own Homes.

And indeed the ſaid King's Attorney General does with all the *French* expect from his Majeſty's ſingle Power the Reparation which theſe Proceedings challenge, and the Conſervation of thoſe Franchiſes which only depend on the Judgment of God, as all the Rights of this Crown, and which can admit of no Diminution but ſuch as the King's Moderation and Juſtice may give them.

But

But as not any thing can contribute more to leſſen in the Minds of Shallow Perſons and Libertins the Veneration which People ought to have for the Power of the Church, than the ill uſe which its Miniſters may make of it; the King's ſaid Attorney General declares, that he is appealing, as indeed he appeals by the preſent Act from the abuſive uſe that is made of it in the ſaid Bull and Ordonance, not to our Holy Father Pope *Innocent* the 11*th* better informed, ſo as has been practiſed in reſpect of ſome of his Predeceſſors; when that they had true Ideas of their Power, that their Years allowed them to act of themſelves; their might be hopes that in time they might be brought to know the Juſtice and Truth of the Complaints that were brought before them; and that neither the Preventions in favour of their Country, nor the Partialities of thoſe they honoured with their Truſt, did not prevail over the Obligations which the Quality of Common Father of all *Chriſtians* does impoſe.

Proteſting to carry on this his ſaid Appeal upon this Grievance, and upon the others, which he reſerves to repreſent to the firſt General Council that ſhall be held, as the Tribunal truly Sovereign and Infallible of the Church, to which its viſible Head muſt ſubmit, as well as its other Members; and therein to further among other things a Regulation that ſhall prevent the Employing ſo Holy an Authority in Uſes ſo far from thoſe for which it was confided in the Church in the Perſon of St. *Peter*;

this may make the Pope be mindful, that God having ſeparated the two Powers of the Prieſthood, and of Empire, His Holineſs cannot make uſe of the Authority of the firſt for the Rights that depend on the ſecond; that according to Temporal Laws he ought to poſſeſs thoſe large Territories which his Predeceſſors have received from the Liberality of Temporal Princes, and particularly from that of our Kings, and that in ſhort, he would conſider upon a Truth which a great Arch-biſhop in *France* wrote to one of his Predeceſſors; that a Prelate that excommunicates a *Chriſtian* contraty to the Rules, and for Rights of a Kingdom of the Earth, may, in ſuch an Occaſion well loſe the Power of binding and unbinding which his Character gives him; but that he cannot deprive of eternal Life, him to whom he does this Injuſtice. if his Sins do not render him unworthy of the Mercy of God. Of which the ſaid Attorney General has required of us as an Act. Done in the Court, in the Preſence of the Kings Council. on the 22d. day of *January*, in the Year 1688.

Monſeignor Sin. Not.

Printed at Paris *by* Francis Muquets, *the King and his Parliaments chief Printer, Street* le Harp, 1688 *With His Majeſties Privilege.*

FINIS.

Cleri *Gallicani* De Ecclesiastica Potestate Declaratio. A. D. 1682.

I. Beato *Petro*, ejusque successoribus Christi vicariis, ipsique Ecclesiæ rerum Spiritualium, & ad Æternam salutem pertinentium non autem Civilium ac Temporalium a Deo traditam Potestatem, dicente Domino, *Regnum meum non est de hoc Mundo.* Et Iterum, *Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari, & quæ sunt Dei Deo*, ac proinde stare Apostolicum illud, *Omnis anima Potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Non est enim Potestas nisi à Deo. Quæ autem sunt, à Deo ordinatæ sunt. Itaque qui Potestati Resistit, Dei ordinationi Resistit.* Reges ergo et Principes in Temporalibus nulli Ecclesiasticæ Potestati Dei ordinatione subjici, neque

The Declaration *of the* Gallican Clergy, *concerning the* Ecclesiastical Power *in the Year* 1682.

I. *That God gave to St.* Peter *and his Successors Vicars of Christ, and to the* Church *her Self the Power of* Spiritual *things pertaining to Eternal Life, but not of* Civil *and* Temporal *Matters. For the Lord said* My Kingdom is not of this World, And again, *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.* And *therefore that of the Apostle must stand*, Let every Soul be subject to the Higher--Powers, for ther is no Power but of God, the Powers that be are Ordained of God; whosoever therefore Resisteth the Power, Resisteth the Ordinance of God. *Therefore* Kings *and* Princes *are not subject, in* Temporals, *to any* Ecclesiastical *Power, by the Or-*

neque Autoritate Clavium Ecclesiæ directe vel indirecte Deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi a Fide, atque Obedientia, ac præstito Fidelitatis Sacramento solvi posse, Eamque sententiam Publicæ Tranquillitati necessariam, nec minus Ecclesiæ quam Imperio utilem, ut verbo Dei, Patrum traditioni, et Sanctorum Exemplis consonam omnino retinendam.

II. Sic autem inesse Apostolicæ sedi, ac *Petri* successoribus Christi vicariis rerum Spiritualium plenam Potestatem, ut simul valeant atque immota consistant Sanctæ Oecumenicæ synodi *Constantienſis* a sede Apostolica comprobata, ipsorumque Romanorum Pontificum, ac totius Ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque ab Ecclesia *Gal-*

dinance of God, neither can they, by Authority of the Keys *of the* Church, *Directly or Indirectly, be* Depos'd, *or their Subjects Absolv'd from their Faith and Obedience, and Oath of Allegiance which they have taken.*

And this is to be firmly Retain'd, as Necessary to the Publick Peace, and not less Useful to the Church *than to the* State, *as being Consonant to the* Word *of* God, *the* Tradition *of the* Fathers, *and* Practice *of the* Saints.

II. *But that the full Power of Spiritual Things is so in the* Apostolical See, *and the* Successors *of* Peter, *the* Vicars *of* Christ, *that the* Decrees *of the* Holy *and* Oecumenical Council *of* Constance, *concerning the Authority of* General Councils, *which are contain'd in the* 4*th and* 5*th* Sessions, *Approved by the* Apostolical See, *and Confirmed by the use*

licana,

licana perpetua Religione cuſtodita Decreta de Autoritate Conciliorum Generalium, quæ Seſſ. 4. & 5. continentur; nec probari a *Gallicana* Eccleſia, qui eorum Decretorum, quaſi Dubiæ ſint Autoritatis, ac minus approbata, robur infringant; aut ad ſolum Schiſmatis tempus Concilii dicta detorqueant.

III. Hinc Apoſtolicæ Poteſtatis uſum Moderandum per Canones, Spiritu Dei Conditos & totius Mundi Reverentia conſecratos Valere etiam Regulas, Mores & Inſtituta a Regno & Eccleſia *Gallicana* recepta, Patrumque terminos manere Inconcuſſus; atque id pertinere ad Amplitudinem Apoſtolicæ ſedis, ut Statua & Conſuetudines tantæ ſedis, &

of the Popes *of* Rome *themſelves, and the whole* Church, *and kept with perpetual Veneration by the* Gallican Church, *ſhou'd likewiſe Remain of Force and Unſhaken.*

Nor are they Approv'd by the Gallican Church, *who wou'd Infringe the Strength of theſe* Decrees, *as if they were of Doubtful Authority or leſs Authentick, or who wou'd Wreſt the Words of the Council only to the time of* Schiſm.

III. *Hence the Uſe of the* Apoſtolical Power *is to be Moderated by the* Canons, *Framed by the* Spirit *of* God, *and Conſecrated by the Veneration of the Whole World. And likewiſe the* Rules, Cuſtoms, *and* Inſtitutions *which have been Receiv'd by the Kingdom and* Gallican Church *are to be in Force, and the Bounds of our Fathers to Remain Unſhaken; And that this is for the Eminence of* Eccle-

Eccleſiarum Conſenſione firmatæ propriam ſtabilitatem obtineant.

the Apoſtolical See, *that the* Statutes *and* Uſage *of ſo Great a* See, *and* Eſtabliſh'd *by the* Conſent *of the* Churches, *ſhou'd obtain their proper Stability.*

IV. In Fidei quoque Queſtionibus præcipuas ſummi Pontificis eſſe Partes, ejuſque Decreta ad omnes & ſingulas Eccleſias pertinere, nec tamen Irreformabile eſſe Judicium, niſi Eccleſiæ Conſenſus acceſſerit.

IV. *The* Pope *likewiſe has the Chief Part in Queſtions concerning the* Faith, *and his* Decrees *have Reſpect to All and Singular Churches: But Nevertheleſs his Judgment is not* Irreformable, *except the Conſent of the* Church *go along with it.*

This should be plaid after the Case Restated

THE

CASE

TRULY

STATED;

Wherein the

CASE Restated

Is fully CONSIDER'D.

By a Member of the Church of England.

---

1 Pet. III. 15. *But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear:*

LONDON:

Printed for *George Strahan* at the *Golden Ball* over against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill.* 1714.

The CASE *truly Stated; or a Vindication of the Case Stated,* &c.

Vindicator. SInce you have been pleased, Sir, to give your self the Trouble of looking over the CASE STATED, with your Popish Friend, I presume it may be no Offence to beg, that you will be so kind as to survey it once more, or rather your Friends Reflections upon it, together with a Member of the Church of *England,* who I assure you means neither you, nor any one else Harm; and who earnestly desires to be serviceable to you to the best Purposes, as *the Author of the Case stated* also did; I mean in order to your Temporal, and much rather to your Eternal Intereſt.

Reſtater. Such Kindness as this is what every one ought highly to value. And could I possibly hope to reap any Advantage by a Review of that *Converſation, between the Lord and the Gentleman,* I should be glad to go over it again and again, till you were quite tired with it. But to deal plainly with you, by what I have seen of it already, I despair of its having any good effect upon me, or any one else that considers it carefully and impartially.

Vind. Do not be so positive. I hope you may find your self mistaken in this Supposition, as fond as you are of it.

Reſt. Then, if you pleaſe, let us try.

Vind. With all my Heart. And may the Almighty graciouſly direct our Underſtandings, that we may diſcern the Truth, and ſincerely embrace and adhere to it.

Reſt. Will you pleaſe then to begin.

Vind. I forbear to enquire what * *extreme Satisfaction* you profeſs to have had, in reading the *Caſe Stated*, and what Expectation you would be thought to have entertained, of its bringing your Popiſh Friend *to renounce a ſuperſtitious Religion, prejudicial to his Intereſts, both in this World, and in the next.* In this I cannot perſwade my ſelf, that you expect, or even deſire to be believed; but doubt rather that you love that *Superſtitious*, and indeed Idolatrous *Religion* too well, to think of parting with it upon whatever account.

Reſt. This is not to the Point we are upon, of the *Caſe Stated.*

Vind. But it certainly is to the point of your Sincerity. However I let it paſs, and proceed to the firſt Section of your Letter; where it is obſervable, you ſilently paſs over what is urged in the *Caſe Stated*, as to the Hope of Salvation in the Church of *England.*

I. *Reſt.* Pray how do you mean? I ſay, †*you ſee, Sir, your Authors firſt Paragraph. Can there be any thing more ſhamefully unjuſt? What Roman Catholick ever denied* Jeruſalem *to be the Mother Church*, &c.

Vind. I am very ſenſible you do ſay it; but that is what I complain of, that you call this the firſt Paragraph, whereas there is certainly another before it; and ſuch an one, as well deſerved your Conſideration. *Pray, my Lord*, ſays our Author, *What is there in the Communion of the* Church of

---

* *Page* 1. † *P.* 5.

England,

England, *should make you think your Soul in any Danger? Would there be any Hazard of your Soul, if there were no Invocation of Saints that are dead, in the Offices of the Church: No Pictures or Images of God to to be seen there: No Elevation of the Host, which was but of late Years brought into the Church: No Prayers for Souls out of* Purgatory: *If the Publick* Prayers *were in the* Vulgar Tongue: *And if the* Sacrament *were given in* both Kinds, *&c.* It is certain, these are things which God has not required at our Hands, all but the Two last. The rest he has no where enjoined, yet you practise them; these he has taught and expressly commanded, and you forbear, and forbid them. And our Worship therefore is not the worse, for not concurring with yours, in these Corruptions, nor our Souls any way endangered by it. So long as we are sound in the Faith, and our Offices right in other Respects, our Service cannot possibly be the less available to Salvation, for being free from groundless Additions. This is so evident to every one, who is but tolerably acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, that it was artfully done of you, to take no notice that any such Case had ever been put, and to call the next the *first Paragraph*, as if none other had gone before it.

II. *Rest.* Well, but what say you, Sir, to what I call the first Paragraph? *Can any thing be more shamefully unjust? What* Roman Catholick *ever denied* Jerusalem *to be the Mother Church in the Sense this Author speaks of?*

Vind. But why do you *Roman Catholicks*, as you stile your selves; why, I say, do you call yours the *Mother Church*, as if all others had sprung from it, when as you know, and do here confess, that not *Rome*, but *Jerusalem* was the first Seat of Christianity, where the Gospel began to be published, and from whence its *Sound went out*, not to *Rome*

only, but *into all Lands*, and its glad Tidings *unto the Ends of the Earth*, and was for this reaſon antiently owned to be * *the Mother of all Churches.*

Reſt. This we all grant; but what I blame this Author for, is, *fixing an Opinion upon us*, which we do not own; as if we held the Church of *Rome*, to be antienter than that of *Jeruſalem.*

Vind. I am ſure this is the moſt natural, and proper Signification of *the Mother of all Churches.*

Reſt. But we plainly declare our meaning in Pope *Pius*'s Creed, when we ſay, *Sanctam Catholicam, & Apoſtolicam Romanam Eccleſiam omnium Eccleſiarum Matrem & Magiſtram agnoſco*, I own the Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick *Roman* Church, to be the Mother and Miſtreſs of all Churches.

Vind. Pardon me good Sir, if I do not think this ſo very plain. For here you acknowledge your *Roman* Church, to be not only the *Miſtreß*, but the *Mother* too of all Churches. And what need of this Title, if you mean no more by it, than you do by the other of *Miſtreſs?*

III. *Reſt.* But what have you to ſay againſt her being the *Miſtreſs* of all other Churches, with an indiſputable Supremacy over them all.

Vind. Well, I will proceed to anſwer this Queſtion, and muſt tell you here, that this is a vain Pretence, and grounded purely upon Uſurpation

Reſt. That is very ſtrange.

Vind. Not ſo very ſtrange neither. For you yourſelf grant † that throughout the Holy Scripture, *there is no Promiſe made to the City of* Rome, *nor the leaſt Intimation of her being Head of the*

---

* Τῆς δὲ γε μητρὸς ἁπασῶν τῆς ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις. *Theod. H. E.* l. 5. c. 9.

† *Page* 7.

Churches

Churches, or the Standard or Center of Unity to 'em all.

Reſt. I do ſo. But then at the ſame time I expreſly tell you, that *the Promiſes were made to St.* Peter, *and in him* to his Succeſſors; and hence it is, the Biſhops of *Rome*, his Succeſſors, now claim to be ſupreme over all the Church, not as ſeated at *Rome*, but as Succeſſors to this Univerſal Paſtor.

Vind. I cannot ſuppoſe you ignorant, that not an Univerſal Supremacy, but a Primacy of Order only, was given to the See of *Rome*, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνων, as the Council of *Chalcedon* ſpeaks, * becauſe of *Rome's* being † *the imperial City*; and that τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal Privileges* were at the ſame time decreed || τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης, τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, *to the moſt Holy Throne of* Conſtantinople, *as of a NEW ROME* *. Whence you muſt confeſs, *Rome* was not then looked upon to have

---

* *Can.* 28.

† *And hereto agrees that of* Irenæus, *l.* 3. *c.* 3. Ad hanc enim Eccleſiam, propter potentiorem Principalitatem, neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam.

|| Ibid.

* *On which Canon, and the* 3*d of* Conſtantinople, *you may obſerve what Conſtruction is made by* Nilus *of* Theſſalonia, περὶ τῶν πάπα ἀρχῆς. *p.* 8. Τί διὰ τὰ τῶν μακαρίνους; &c. What elſe do we learn from hence, but that the Pope had his Primacy above other Churches given him, not by the Apoſtles, but by the Fathers. And that it was becauſe *Rome* was the Imperial City. For ſo ſays the Canon, ἀφορμὴ τῆς πατέρων δέδωκε τῷ πάπα τὰ πρεσβεῖα, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, The Privileges were given the Pope by the Fathers, becauſe this was the Chief and Imperial City. And if it had the Preheminence upon this Account, then not becauſe of its Biſhop being St. *Peter's* Succeſſor; and moreover, if it was only from the Fathers [*aſſembled in Council*] then not from the Apoſtles. *See alſo* Barlaam *to the ſame purpoſe. c.* 5. *p.* 26. *and* Sozomen. H. E. *l.* 7. *c.* 9.

ſuch an exalted Supremacy, as ſhe now pretends to; and again, that what ſhe had was not by any Divine Right, but by the Decrees of Councils, and the ſingular Regard that was paid to her as the Seat of the Emperor. You know alſo your own Pope *Gregory* the Great, in an Epiſtle to the Emperor *Mauritius*, notes it as a Mark of Antichriſtian Pride, for any one to pretend to the Title of Univerſal Biſhop. His Words are theſe; * *I boldly affirm, that whoſoever calls himſelf Univerſal Biſhop, or deſires to be ſo called by others, ſhews himſelf by ſuch his Haughtineſs, to be a Fore-runner of Antichriſt, in as much as he proudly advances himſelf above all others.*

Reſt. I cannot deny, but he ſpeaks alſo to the ſame purpoſe, in divers other Places.

Vind. Be pleaſed therefore to remember it.

Reſt. But we have † plain Proof of St. *Peter's* Supremacy, and by conſequence of his Succeſſors the Biſhops of *Rome* in their ſeveral Generations.

Vind. May I know your Proof, firſt of St. *Peter's* Supremacy, and afterwards of the Pope's.

---

* Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quiſquis ſe univerſalem Sacerdotem vocat, aut vocari deſiderat, in Elatione ſuâ Antichriſtum præcurrit, quia ſuperbiendo ſe cæteris præponit. *L.* 6. *Ep.* 194. *Vide etiam l.* 4. *ep.* 76, 78, 80, 82.

† *C. R. p.* 8. *You put St.* Jerom, *St.* Cyprian, *and St.* Chryſoſtom *in your Margin, in hope the unwary Reader will conclude them to bear Teſtimony to St.* Peter's *Supremacy. But give me leave to tell you, that he who can find any ſuch thing in any of the Places referred to, muſt have better Eyes than I have. For I cannot poſſibly ſee it there. The firſt and laſt have not one Line on this Subject, and you might as well have referred to St.* Ignatius's *Epiſtles, or* Hermas's *Paſtor. And the other declares our Saviour would found his Church upon one, as I ſhall hereafter ſhew he did; yet at the ſame time he affirms, that our Lord gave all his Apoſtles equal Power and Authority, and ſo no one of them could claim a Superiority over the others.*

Reſt.

Reſt. Our Proof of St. *Peter's* Supremacy is two-fold, from Scripture and Univerſal Tradition.

Vind. That your Tradition is not ſo univerſal as you imagine, is pretty evident, from what I have juſt now obſerved to you, and will be more ſo before we part. But pray let me hear, what Authority you have for it from Scripture.

Reſt. You ſhall. Only give me leave by the way, to put you in mind, that this is more than I am any way obliged to. For tell me I pray, * *Muſt nothing be believed but what is in Scripture? Does the Scripture mention every Place, where every Apoſtle preached the Goſpel, or of which they were Biſhops?*

Vind. Who ſays it does? But its Silence in this Reſpect will never prove, that it might not juſtly be expected, to ſpeak of ſo weighty a Point as the Univerſal Supremacy, of the chief Paſtor of all the Churches, if there had been any ſuch. This is a matter of that vaſt conſequence to the whole Body of Chriſtians, that it cannot be imagined, the ſacred Writers would all have paſſed it over in Silence: If St. *Peter*, and the Popes after him, were to have had the ſole Power of governing the whole Church, and of determining all Controverſies in Matters of Religion, to tell this to the World, and enjoin all Chriſtians in whatever Parts, to addreſs to them for their Deciſions, had been ſo expeditious a way for preventing, or at leaſt putting a ſpeedy End to, the many Differences that have from time to time infeſted the Church, then it cannot be thought Almighty God would not have preſcribed it, in very plain and legible Characters, that every one might ſee it. And if all Churches were neceſſarily to own the

---

* *C. R. p.* 8.

Church

Church of *Rome* for their Head, and could hope for no Salvation without it; no doubt thoſe ſame Scriptures which enjoin the other Parts of our Duty, would not have failed to inform us of this likewiſe, leaſt otherwiſe we ſhould run blindly into Perdition.

Reſt. This needs ſome Conſideration.

Vind. And yet I have ſomething farther to urge in behalf of the Scriptures, which I am apt to think you have not duly attended to.

Reſt. Pray what is that?

Vind. Do not you teach that St. *Peter*'s Supremacy is founded on Scripture.

Reſt. Yes certainly.

Vind. How comes it to paſs then, that the Scripture's Silence in this Caſe is judged ſo little to the purpoſe? Your Claim is from Scripture, and yet you make it not neceſſary for the Scripture to ſay any thing of it. This is ſaying and unſaying with a Witneſs. And a Man that writes at this rate may ſet up for an Advocate, for whatever Cauſe, but will be ſure to do right to none.

Reſt. I did not think of this. But yet after all, if nothing but Scripture will ſerve you, you ſhall have it preſently. But here comes a Paſſage in my way, which I muſt firſt beg leave to take ſome notice of. * *Pray Sir, what does* your Author *mean by ſuch an Univerſal Supremacy, as ſome Popes have claimed? Some Popes have claimed* a Temporal, *as well as* a Spiritual Supremacy. *Your Author ſhould know, this is no Part of our Faith. Popes are Men, and have their Failings, as others have --- That the Paſſages he quotes, cannot be ſtrained to the Pope's Temporal Supremacy, and that they were not ſo underſtood, in the Primitive Church, I will not deny.*

---

* *C. R. p.* 10.

Vind.

Vind. To omit Numbers of extravagant Sayings to this purpose in the Canonists. I presume you will not deny likewise, that † *Bellarmin*, and * others of your Principal Writers do assert, and earnestly ∴ contend for such a Power in the Pope, at least indirectly, and *in ordine ad spiritualia*. And if he exercises it, as he has often || done; it matters not much to those who feel the effects of it, what the Pretence for it be. Your own most Learned and Judicious *Du Pin* proclaims it, as a matter out of doubt, that not only the rest of the Empire, and

---

† De Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 6. & in Barclaium *c.* 16.

* Pontificem esse caput totius Ecclesiæ, & habere potestatem etiam circa omnia temporalia, probamus ex Theologis & Canonistis. *Boz. de Eccl. Monarch. temp.* Epist. Dedicat. ad *Clem.* VIII. *Pontif.* Qui est Deus in terris, Deus universi, Regum Pater. *Martin.* V. in Conc. *Sienn.* In Ecclesiâ Christianâ potestas temporalis subjecta & subordinata est potestati spirituali : Ergo Princeps spiritualis potest imperare Principi temporali, & disponere de rebus temporalibus in ordine ad bonum spirituale. *Becan.* de Jure & Just. *c.* III. Quæst. VII. Negant Hæretici ---- Pontificem posse ullo modo imperare Principibus sæcularibus, neque regnis ; & principatu posse eos privare, etsi illi privari alioqui mereantur. *Id.* Quæst. VIII. Certè qui in potestate Petri temporalem gladium esse negat, malè verbum attendit Domini proferentis, converte gladium tuum in vaginam, uterque ergo est in potestate Ecclesiæ, spiritualis scilicet gladius & materialis. *Bonif.* Octav. in extravagante *unam sanctam.*

∴ *As is to be seen at large in* Chamier de Temporali Papæ Potestate. *See also* C. Perron. Repl. à la Response du Roy &c. *p.* 73. & *Harangue* au tiers état. *p.* 600, &c. & 621. *Richer.* Hist. Conc. General. *l.* 1. *c.* 8. *n.* 13. *De Serres* Invent. de l'hist. de France, l'ann. 1613.

|| *Platin.* in vit. *Greg.* 7. & *Bin.* Conc. to. 7. *p.* 484. *Plat.* in vit. *Honor.* 3. *Greg.* 9. & *Innoc.* 4. Bull. *Sixti.* V. contra *Hen. Navarr. Sand.* de schism. Angl. *l.* 1. *p.* 131. & *l.* 3. *p.* 368. *Cherub.* Bullar. *p.* 704. &c. *Cambd.* vit. *Eliz.* Regin. *part.* 2. A.D. 1570. *Du Pin.* de Antiq. Eccl. Disciplinâ Dissert. 4. *p.* 333.

more

more particularly of *Italy*, but even || *Rome* it self was under the Civil Government of *Conſtantine* and his Succeſſors, and not of the Pope. But as abſurd and unreaſonable as this Claim is, you ſay you can maintain it from Scripture.

Reſt. Yes, very eaſily. Did you never read thoſe Words in the New Teſtament. * *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*: And thoſe others, † *Feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep?*

Vind. I know thoſe Words very well; but I hoped you would have given ſome Evidence from Scripture, of this Supremacy you are contending for. And do you now think to put me off with theſe Paſſages, which prove nothing like it?

Reſt. Pray Sir think again. Do you not ſee it plainly proved here?

Vind. By no means. Our Saviour ſays, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* But you very well remember, our Author has ∴ already obſerv'd to you, || St. *Auguſtin*, * *Gregory Nazianzen*, † St. *Cyril*, || St. *Chryſoſtom*, * St. *Ambroſe*, and † *Hilary* of *Poictiers*, profeſs the Rock here ſpoken

---

|| Il eſt conſtant que la ville de Rome, l'Italie, & toutes les autres Provinces de l'Empire de l'occident, ont été, ſous la puiſſance de Conſtantine & des Empereurs qui lui ont ſuccedé. L'Hiſtoire nous apprend, qu'ils en étoient les Maîtres abſolus, qu'ils y envoioient des Gouverneurs, que la ville de Rome dependoit de leur Loix, de leur pouvoir, & des Magiſtrats qu'ils y vouloient établir, qu'ils y faiſoient tel changement que bon leur ſembloit; en un mot, qu'ils n'en étoient pas moins les Maîtres que de toutes les autres villes du monde. *Nouv. Biblioth.* To. 2. *p.* 21. edit. in 4to.

* *St.* Matthew 16. 18. † *St.* John 21. 15, 16, 17.

∴ *Caſe Stated p.* 5.

|| De verbis Domini Serm. 13.

* De Vet. Teſt. † De Trin. *l.* 4.

|| Hom. 55. in Matth.

* In Epheſ. 2. † De Trin. *l.* 2. *c.* 6.

of

of was not *Peter*, but that Faith which *Peter* here confeſſed, and has told you † there are many more. And do you diſpute the Truth of this?

Reſt. You do not find me queſtioning it. But yet I hope I have at leaſt ballanc'd theſe, by an Addition of other Fathers that ſpeak otherwiſe.

Vind. This if true may ſhew the Fathers to be divided in their Judgment, about the Senſe of this Text. But that they are ſo, is a very odd Medium for proving them all of your ſide, and manifeſtly proves the contrary. But now if even theſe few you cite ſhould be againſt you, what becomes then of your Supremacy?

Reſt. I have taken care to pick out ſuch Authorities, as cannot fail me. Never fear that.

Vind. The firſt is in an Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian* to * *Florentius Pupianus*; where *Rigaltius* an eminent Commentator, and one of your own Communion, † interprets St. *Cyprian*'s Words concerning this Promiſe of our bleſſed Saviour, in like manner as our Author does. The next is in St. *Baſil* upon the Second Chapter of *Iſaiah*, where ſpeaking of *the Church of the living God*, he ſays, || ἧς οἱ θεμέλιοι εἰσιν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῖς ἁγίοις, *&c. whoſe Foundations are upon the Holy Mountains. For it is built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets. One of theſe Mountains was* Peter, *upon which Rock our Lord promiſed to build his Church.* Where St. *Baſil* teaches *Peter* to be one of the Mountains, on which the Church was to be built; though but one, for it was to be built not only upon St. *Peter*, but upon the reſt of the Apoſtles with him. And what you will get by this, I cannot underſtand. You hint alſo at ſome Place, in one of his Treatiſes againſt

† *Amongſt others Juſt. M. c.* Tryph. *p.* 327. *Theod. Ep.* 77. & *Theophyl.* in loc..

† Annot. Oxon. in loc.

* Ep. 66.

|| To. 2. *p.* 70.

Eunomius,

Eunomius, but not being pleaſed to tell which of them, you make me ſuſpect there is nothing to the purpoſe there. And I hope you will excuſe me, if I do not turn over all five of them, in purſuit of what I ſo little expect to find by it. After St. *Baſil* you appeal to St. *Chryſoſtom de Petro & Paulo*; but for what Reaſon I cannot conceive, unleſs purely to adorn your Margin with ſo great a Name. For in the firſt place, you cannot but know, that it is queſtioned by Learned Men, whether this Oration be St. *Chryſoſtom*'s. But not to inſiſt upon that, though an unanſwerable Objection, here is nothing at all that anſwers your Deſign. The Author, whoſoever he was, magnifies and applauds theſe Two great Apoſtles, but ſays not a Word, that I can find, of the Text now under Conſideration. And in his Praiſes of the Apoſtles, if he give the Preference to either above the other, it ſeems to be to St. *Paul*. I grant he puts the Queſtion, ‖ τί γὰρ Πέτρου μεῖζον; *Tell me what is greater than St.* Peter? But this will not anſwer your Intent, for the next Words following are, τί δὲ Παύλου ἴσον; *but what is equal to* Paul? Which is ſo far from eſtabliſhing St. *Peter*'s Supremacy, or proving him to be the Rock, on which our Saviour was to build his Church, that it gives St. *Paul* as good, if not a better Title to it. St. *Jerom** ſpeaks more in your favour, yet does not ſo particularly appropriate the Bleſſing he promiſed, as to make it belong to St. *Peter* alone. For thus he expreſſes himſelf. *As our Saviour gave to the Apoſtles, that they might be called the Light of the World, and they received other Appellations from him; ſo alſo to* Simon, *who believed in Chriſt the Rock, he gave the Name of* Peter. *And according to the Metaphor of a Rock, it is*

‖ To. 5. *p.* 992. Edit. Savil. * In loc.

rightly

rightly said to him, I will build my Church upon Thee. Here the Words you referred to, denote St. *Peter*, not his Faith or Profession, to be the Rock on which the Church was to be built. But withal you see, that it was only in common with his Fellow Apostles, to whom our Lord gave the Privilege of being Lights to the World, whereby to conduct them to his Church and Religion. The next is St. *Augustin* who says, * *The Lord named* Peter *the Foundation of the Church, and therefore the Church worthily honours this Foundation, upon which the Height of the Ecclesiastical Building is raised.* And here you think you have me very sure.

Rest. And what can you say for your self?

Vind. I can say, the best way to understand St. *Augustin*'s Meaning, is by letting him be his own Interpreter, who certainly best understood his own Sense. And this I think he gives us very clearly in his Exposition of St. *John*'s Gospel, in these Words, † *For the Lord says, upon this Rock I will build my Church, because* Peter *had said, thou art Christ the Son of the living God. Therefore upon this Rock which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church. For the Rock was Christ, upon which Foundation even* Peter *himself was built.* Nay upon the very next Sermon to that here referred to || are these Words, *He is called a Rock, because he first laid the Foundations of Faith to the Nations, and like an immoveable Stone supported the Frame and Mass of the whole Christian Building. He is therefore termed a Rock, upon the account of his Devotion, and the Lord is called a Rock upon the account of his Power, as says the Apostle*: They drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed

---

* Serm. 15. de sanctis.
† Tract. 124. de Cap. 21. To. 9. *p.* 389.
|| Serm. 2. in eodem festo. To. 10. *p.* 852.

them,

them, and that Rock was Christ. *He rightly obtains a Partnership in the Name, who bears his Part in the Work. For in the same House* Peter *lays the Foundation,* Peter *plants,* the Lord *waters, and gives the Increase.* Thus far I think your Authorities signify so little, that what you get by them you may put in your Eye, and see never the worse. But there is one other yet remaining, which comes therefore to be considered in the last place, and that is of St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria,* ‖ in his second Book, you tell us upon St. *John* and the Twelfth Chapter. Whereto it might suffice to answer, you ought to have known that there being but Nine Chapters in that Book, you will not be able to find any thing to your purpose in a Twelfth. But I am willing to try, if I can help you out of the streight you have brought your self into by taking this Reference upon Trust. And I therefore own that in the first Chapter of the first Book, is what I persuade my self you would have rejoiced at, had you been aware of its being there. The Substance of it is, that our Saviour would no longer have the Apostle we are concerned about, go by the Name of *Simon,* but gave him that of *Peter,* because of it's Affinity to Πέτρα a Rock. This might have been of some Service to you, but that St. *Cyril* upon another occasion, takes these Words of our Lord in the other Sense. For there he declares * this Name to signify *nothing else but the immoveable steady Faith of the Disciple, on which the Church of Christ is settled and established beyond Danger of falling, and remains continually in defiance to all the shocks of the Gates of Hell.* Be pleased to take this along with you, and then you are at free Liberty to make what use you can of this Father.

‖ *L.* 2. *in* John *c.* 12. * De S. Trin. Dial. 4.

Rest.

Reſt. I ſee you will have ſomething to object to the fulleſt Evidence I can bring againſt you.

Vind. That is only becauſe it is not full enough. Of all the Authors you have cited, not ſo much as one is throughly of your Opinion. And of this you was ſo ſenſible before-hand, that you knew not how poſitively to deny it, and therefore declare your ſelf to † *own ſome of them, look upon this Paſſage of St.* Matthew, *as having two Senſes, and ſometimes they take it in one Senſe, and ſometimes in the other.*

Reſt. But ∴ *I defy* your Author, *and all his Party together, to ſhew any Paſſage of any Father, that excludes St.* Peter.

Vind. Notably ſpoken and like a brave Hero! However I accept the Challenge. And ſince you grant any Paſſage of any Father will ſuffice, what ſay you to this in *Palladius.* * Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ Πέτρᾳ, τοῦτ' ἔστι τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ, οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this* Rock, *that is to ſay, this Confeſſion I will build my Church?* It is very full and expreſs.

Reſt. It ſeems ſo at firſt View.

Vind. And certainly is ſo. However take another. It is of St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*; and you may anſwer it when you can. || *He gave the Name of the* Rock *to nothing elſe, but the unſhaken and moſt conſtant Faith of the Diſciple, on which the Church of Chriſt is ſo ſettled and eſtabliſhed, as never to fall, but to bear up againſt the Gates of Hell, and ſo to remain for ever.* This I hope is as excluſive of St. *Peter,* as you can expect or deſire. For if nothing elſe was called the Rock, but *the Faith of the Diſciple,* then in this Father's Opinion St. *Peter* himſelf was not

† *C. R. p.* 11. ∴ Ibid.
* Devit. Chryſoſt. *c.* 19. || Dial. de Trin. *l.* 4.

the Rock. And yet I will take the Liberty to add a Teſtimony or two more, which happen to come in my way; that ſo out of the Mouth of three or four Witneſſes, you may be fully convinced. In a *Saxon* Homily quoted by † *Bede* is this Paſſage. *I build my Church upon this Rock*, that is upon the Belief *that thou confeſſeſt. The whole Church of God is founded upon this Rock, that is upon Chriſt. For he is the Foundation of all the Building of his Church.* If you can find that this Profeſſion is not excluſive of St. *Peter*, you will make a great and unexpected Diſcovery. And yet this is not all. I have already given you ſome account of St. *Auguſtin*'s Judgment in the Caſe; but I have now another Teſtimony from him that requires your Conſideration. And it is this. * *It is ſaid by the Lord, thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church, namely the Rock which* Peter *has confeſſed, ſaying,* thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God. *As if* Peter, *who had his Name from this Rock,* || *was to repreſent the Church built upon this Rock, and has received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. For it is not ſaid, thou art the Rock, but thou art* † Peter. *But the Rock was Chriſt, whom* Simon *having confeſſed, as the whole Church confeſſes him, he is called* Peter. You cannot deny *Peter* to be undoubtedly excluded here from being the Rock, *It is not ſaid to him,* ſays the Father, *Thou art the* Rock; and if this be not a ſufficient Excluſion of him, I know not what will or can ſatisfie you.

Reſt. I did not conceive you could have ſaid ſo much for your ſelf.

Vind. This is not the firſt time you have been miſtaken. And to ſhew that you are ſo in another

---

† Serm. Cath. Kal. Jul. Paſſ. Apoſt. Pet. & Paul. *p.* 237.
* Retract. l. 1. *c.* 21. || Petra. † Petrus.

reſpect

reſpect too, with Relation to the Text we have been ſo long upon, if it will oblige you much, I will now quit our Author for a while, and ſuppoſe with you St. *Peter* himſelf, and not the Faith he profeſſed, to be the Rock ſpoken of by our Saviour, and then will leave it to you, to make the beſt you can of this Suppoſition. For all you can infer from hence, is only that the Church ſhould in ſome Senſe be built upon St. *Peter*; as it was to be alſo upon the reſt of the Apoſtles. For ſo ſays St. *Paul*, Epheſ. ii. 20. *And are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-ſtone.* Whence it appears, that the other Apoſtles were Foundation-ſtones in this Eccleſiaſtical Building, and not St. *Peter* alone, tho' I deny not but he was more remarkably ſo, than the reſt of them. For it may eaſily be granted, that a peculiar Privilege was deſigned him in theſe Words, and that by him, after our Bleſſed Saviour, the Foundation of the Church ſhould be firſt laid, for the other Apoſtles to build upon, amongſt both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And if this were what our Lord intended, it was accordingly verified, as we read in the *Acts* of the Holy *Apoſtles*. For no ſooner had this Apoſtle preached to the *Jews*, and converted Three Thouſands of them, *Ch.* ii. 41. which were added to the Hundred and Twenty Diſciples, but preſently we are told, *Verſe* 47. *that the Lord added to the Church daily ſuch as ſhould be ſaved.* So that here was now a Church, and this Church in an eſpecial manner built upon St. *Peter*, according to our Saviour's Promiſe. But then he was farther to lay the Foundation of the *Gentile* Church too, as well as the *Jewiſh*. And accordingly when *Cornelius* a *Roman* Centurion was to be admitted into the Number of Chriſtians, St. *Peter* was ſent upon this Errand, *Ch.* x. 19, *&c.* And when he

had preached the Gospel at *Cæsarea*, and the Spirit had come upon them that heard him, to the Astonishment of *those of the Circumcision*, who now saw, *that on the Gentiles also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost*, verse 45. *he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord*, verse 48. And afterwards in the Council at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* xv. 7. He made his Appeal concerning this Truth, to all there assembled, *Ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the words of the Gospel, and believe.* So that here was a perfect Completion of our Saviour's Promise to St. *Peter*, so far as it contained any Prerogative peculiar to himself. And I am well assured, with all the Assistance you can get, you will never be able to make more of it.

Rest. * *I deny that these Words are not a sufficient Proof for the Spiritual Supremacy, which all Popes have claimed, or that they were not so understood in the Primitive Church.*

Vind. I know you do; but I am not bound to acquiesce in your Determination. It is not your Denial we want, but the Reason of it, and that you will be so kind as to shew us our Error if we be in one, by some good Evidence of it for our Conviction I have particularly observed, that you have given no Proof, that the *Rock* spoken of was St. *Peter*, and not rather his frank Confession of our Saviour; and that you have not disproved, what our Author had hinted concerning the Judgment of the Fathers in this behalf. I have moreover produced divers other Citations, to make this Truth the more apparent. And after this have nevertheless taken the Words in your Sense, and shewn that when so interpreted,

---

* *C. R. p.* 10.

they

they were remarkably fulfilled in St. *Peter's* laying the firſt Foundation of the Church, amongſt both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And by conſequence, if you have no better Arguments for your pretended univerſal Supremacy, than what this Text affords, it is time to give over your Claim to it.

Reſt. But what ſay you to the Commiſſion given to St. *Peter*, to *feed* our Saviour's *Sheep* and *Lambs*? Let me tell you, * *This Text is more expreſs to prove St.* Peter's *Primacy, than any your Author has mentioned for St.* Paul.

Vind. What our Author has mentioned for St *Paul*, ſhall be conſidered in its proper Place. At preſent you may pleaſe to take notice, that if theſe Words be of any Uſe to prove a Supremacy in St. *Peter*, they will certainly overthrow ſuch an one as you contend for, by proving too much, and ſo will be of no Advantage to you.

Reſt. If they be of any Uſe to prove it! Why do you queſtion that?

Vind. I not only queſtion, but deny it, and have a great deal of Reaſon for ſo doing. Nor would any one, not mightily under the Power of Prejudice, ever attempt to raiſe ſo weighty a Superſtructure upon ſo feeble and ſandy a Foundation as this is. It was the neceſſary Duty of all the Apoſtles, during their Time, and of their Succeſſors in all following Generations, to *feed* our Saviour's *Lambs* and *Sheep*. And what tho' St. *Peter* was required to do the ſame, this implies no more Juriſdiction in him, than in the other Apoſtles, on each of whom this Duty was no leſs incumbent than on him. It is true, our Saviour gave him a particular Charge to be careful in this reſpect, and repeated it a ſecond, and a third time

---

* *P.* 12.

to make him the more ſenſible of it. But then you are to know, that if the Words themſelves do not convey any ſuch paramount Juriſdiction, the Repetition of them can never do it. This ſeems to have been rather by way of Reprehenſion to the Apoſtle, for his notorious Sin of thrice openly denying his Maſter, when he had but juſt before made Profeſſion of an immoveable Fidelity to him. Which gave juſt reaſon to our Saviour, to be more than ordinarily ſtrict in his Injunctions to this Apoſtle, whereby to make him the more careful and diligent for the future. And this is all the Cauſe I can ſee, for our Saviour's thus commanding him to be particularly mindful of his Flock, to look watchfully after them, and give them their Meat in due Seaſon. And in this Opinion I am the more confirmed, becauſe, as I ſaid, if any Supremacy were conveyed by theſe Words, they would prove too much; and ſo we ſhould have a greater Number of Supremes than you are aware of.

Reſt. I do not ſee that.

Vind. Perhaps ſo; but I ſhall prove it to you.

Reſt. That is impoſſible.

Vind. Pray caſt your Eye upon theſe Words of St. *Paul*, * *Take heed unto your ſelves and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you Overſeers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchaſed with his own Blood.* This Charge St. *Paul* does not give to the Elders of the Church of *Epheſus*, barely upon his own Apoſtolical Authority, but expreſly declares them to have been conſtituted by the Holy Ghoſt, Overſeers over the Flock of God, his *Church*, and that it was therefore their indiſpenſable Duty to *feed* it. So that if a Divine Commiſſion for the Performance of this important Duty, entails an

---

* *Acts* xx. 28.

Uni-

Universal Supremacy upon the Person that has it, here were at once as many invested with this high Authority, as there were *Ephesian* Elders at that time. For all these the Apostle declares to have been endowed by the Holy Ghost with sufficient Power to *feed* the Flock of Christ. Wherefore you must either grant the Church, at least at that time, to have had so many supreme Heads, which I fully perswade my self you will not, or must yield that a Commission to *feed* these *Sheep*, is not a sufficient Foundation, whereupon to erect an Universal Supremacy for any one.

Rest. This I had not thought of, and I beg leave to consider it.

Vind. In the mean time let me add a farther Remark, for clearing of this Point we have been so long upon, of St. *Peter*'s Universal Supremacy, which is this, that St. *Peter* never pretended all his Life time, to any such singular Privilege; and yet one would think he should have understood the Nature, and Extent of his own Authority, as well as you, or any of your Church can do at this great distance. To evince this, I desire it may be remembred, that he had so many Occasions for exerting this Power, had he believed himself to have it, that he could not well have failed, of leaving divers Instances of it upon Record; and yet the most diligent Enquirer amongst us can discover no one Memorandum of it. When a new Apostle was to be chosen, there was no Application made to St. *Peter*, either to tell them whom he would nominate to that Office, or to issue out his Warrant for an Election. In the Council assembled at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* xv. there is no Intimation of St. *Peter*'s presiding there, but St. *James* appears rather to have had the Preheminence, as Bishop of that See. And it is certain, He, not St. *Peter*, pronounced the Decree.

So likewise *when the Apostles at Jerusalem had heard, that Samaria had received the Word of God*, Acts viii. 14. Observe what follows hereupon. St. *Peter* did not order some of the other Apostles, to go, and instruct, and baptize them; but on the contrary, the Text tells us plainly, *the Apostles sent to them* Peter *and* John. Again, when the Divisions were so rife in the Church of *Corinth*, * one being for *Paul*, and another for *Apollos*, &c. St. *Peter* was not sent to for the Decision of these Controversies; nor did he ever take upon him to determine them, or to punish those who were in the wrong, as doubtless he would have done, had it been his Province: Nor is it to be thought, he would so patiently have born with St. *Paul*'s *withstanding him to his Face*, as we find he did †, had he known himself his Sovereign; nor on the other hand, would St. *Paul* have allowed himself to do it, had he known the other to be his lawful Superior, and the only chief Governor over all the Apostles.

Rest. You run so fast, you seem to have forgotten, that I have already given a full Answer to these Instances you are pressing again upon me, as if nothing had been said to them.

Vind. They are so full against any Claim of a Supremacy in St *Peter*, that I could not omit them; and how satisfactorily you have answered any of them, I come next to shew. I begin therefore with St. *Peter*'s being sent to *Samaria*. Of this says our Author, || *It had little become the Apostles, to send their Sovereign upon Business, as they sent* Peter *to* Samaria, *if they had owned him for such.* Whereto you reply by way of Query, whether

---

* 1 *Cor.* i. 1, 2. † *Gal.* ii. 11.
|| *C. S. p.* 6.

he thinks * *all sending denotes Superiority in the Senders, and Subjection in the Sent?*

Reſt. And what have you to ſay to this?

Vind. That inſtead of anſwering his Argument you have choſen purely to evade it; and the better to do this, have ſtarted a new Queſtion. You ask, whether *all ſending denotes Superiority in the Senders*, but do not ſay whether it would be thought indecent, for Subjects to take upon them to ſend their Sovereign; which was our Author's Argument: However in anſwer to your Query, I grant that to ſend another, does not neceſſarily and always, tho' ordinarily it does, denote an Inferiority in the Perſon ſent. Nor need it; for to overthrow your Plea, it is enough that it denote an Equality. And this ſufficiently anſwers your Queſtion, and the two firſt Inſtances you bring for its Confirmation. And the third I believe, upon ſecond Thoughts you will not be backward to retract. At leaſt till you find out ſome Privy Council, that has really attempted to ſend their Sovereign to the War. They may adviſe, and humbly and dutifully encourage him to it, where they ſee Reaſon for it, without exceeding their proper Province; but ſending him is an Act of a very different nature. And perhaps you are the firſt, that ever ventured to confound them. I am ſure I muſt believe ſo, till you can produce ſome Evidence to the contrary.

Reſt. Another thing your Author urges with good Aſſurance, is St. *Paul*'s withſtanding † St. *Peter to his face. This*, ſays he, || *ſeems a Behaviour not very ſuitable to the ſupreme Head of the Church, both* Jews *and* Gentiles, *if St.* Paul *had known any thing of St.* Peter's *being ſo conſtituted by Chriſt.*

---

* *C. R. p.* 16. † Gal. ii. 11. || *C. S. p.* 6.

Vind.

Vind. And his Remark is very juſt, being no more than what St. *Cyprian* had taught long before, in one of his Epiſtles; where upon occaſion of the Contention between theſe two great Apoſtles, he affirms, * *Nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit,* &c. *Neither did Peter whom the Lord choſe firſt, and* † *on whom he built his Church, inſolently claim, or arrogantly aſſume any thing to himſelf, when Paul diſputed with him, about Circumciſion, as if he had a Superiority over the reſt, and that he ought rather to be obeyed by the recenteſt and laſt Apoſtles.* Here you ſee, this zealous Father ſpeaks of the Superiority you are ſo earneſt for, as what it would have been Inſolence and Arrogance in St. *Peter* to have pretended to, even over St. *Paul* and others the very laſt of the Apoſtles. Whereto alſo agrees that of *Hilary* the Deacon in his Commentary upon theſe Words of St. *Paul.* || *Who of them durſt reſiſt Peter the firſt Apoſtle, to whom the Lord gave the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; but ſuch another, who well knowing himſelf inveſted with an Equality of Power, might conſtantly bear his Teſtimony, againſt what this Apoſtle had unadviſedly done?* This is the ſame Doctrine our Author teaches; and it was good Catholick Doctrine in thoſe early Times of Chriſtianity. But now it ſeems, it will not go down with you, and thoſe of your Party. I am inclinable to think, ſuch an open Oppoſition would not be allowed of as a ſuitable Carriage, towards your Sovereign Lord the Pope. And yet the great Apoſtle of the

---

* Ep. 71. Quinto Fratri.

† Vid. Annot. Oxon. in loc.

|| Quis eorum auderet Petro primo Apoſtolo, cui claves regni cœlorum Dominus dedit, reſiſtere: niſi alius talis, qui fiduciâ Electionis ſuæ ſciens ſe non imparem, conſtanter improbaret, quod ille ſine conſilio fecerat. *Hil. Diac.* in *Gal* ii. 11. Inter Opera S. *Ambroſii.* To. 3.

Gentiles

Gentiles was not aſhamed to own, that he had uſed it towards St. *Peter*, under whom your Popes make their Claim.

Reſt. No matter for that. I have given you Inſtances of *Jethro*'s withſtanding *Moſes*.

Vind. As much as to ſay he withſtood, or rebuked his Son in Law, who kept his Cattel for him. *Exod.* ii. 21. and iii. 1. A wonderful Argument for evincing the Dutifulneſs of a Subject's treating the Head of the Univerſal Church in a like manner, had it been true! But I muſt beg a little farther Information, before I can admit of it as ſuch. For as you are not pleaſed to tell us, whence you had your notice, of this Conteſt between *Moſes* and his Father in Law; ſo I muſt own my Ignorance of it, and do therefore conceive, you have fallen into a ſmall Miſtake, uſing the Name of *Jethro*, inſtead of thoſe Egyptian Magicians, *Jannes* and *Jambres*, of whom St. *Paul* tells us, * that they withſtood *Moſes*. And I hope you will not recommend ſuch notorious Heathen Impoſtors, as a Pattern for the Imitation of Chriſtian Subjects towards their Superiors.

Reſt. No I did not deſign that. But I tell you farther that *Joab* withſtood *David*.

Vind. And I muſt take the Liberty to tell you, that † *Menochius*, and other Commentators blame him for it, as not reſpectful enough to his Sovereign. And I cannot doubt, but you would have been ready your ſelf, at another time, to diſapprove of ſuch a Behaviour in any Subject, towards his King, and more eſpecially towards ſo great an Apoſtle, ſuch an univerſal Governor, as you ſuppoſe St. *Peter* to have been, howſoever at preſent, to ſerve a Cauſe, you are willing to excuſe it.

---

* 2 *Tim.* iii. 8. † *In* 2 *Sam.* xix. 6.

Reſt.

Reſt. I ſay farther St. *John* Baptiſt withſtood *Herod*; and what Objection have you againſt this? Will you ſay either that I am miſtaken, or that he was to blame for it?

Vind. I ſay neither. St. *John* was a Prophet, and *more*, ſays our * Saviour, *than a Prophet*, and if as ſuch, he reproved a wicked King for his Vices, when they became ſcandalouſly flagitious and abominable, you will hardly ſay he herein exceeded his Commiſſion. But ſure you will not pretend to parallel St. *Peter* to *Herod*, or affirm that he was equally to be withſtood. Eſpecially had he been as much above all Kings, and other Potentates, as thoſe of your Way would have him thought to have been.

Reſt. I add moreover, that † *Porphyry* blamed St *Paul*, for withſtanding St. *Peter*, looking upon it as unpardonable *Sawcineſs*, thus to *oppoſe his Superior*; and infer from hence, that || St. *Peter's Supremacy was ſo notoriouſly known, that the Heathens themſelves were convinced, it was the common Belief of the Chriſtians.*

Vind. So that it ſeems for want of Chriſtian Evidence, you are come now to the Teſtimony of a malicious Heathen Enemy to Chriſtianity, a *Villain* as you think fit to characterize him, and by conſequence a notable Prop for the Support of your ſinking Cauſe. You are not pleaſed to acquaint us, whence you had this Teſtimony. Nor am I much concerned about it. I doubt not but it comes originally from St. *Jerom's* Preface, to his Comment on the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, where he reckons this as one of the Objections that had been raiſed againſt the Apoſtles and their Doctrine, and more particularly againſt this Epiſtle

---

* St. *Mat.* xi 9. † *C. R. p.* 15. || Ibid.

of

of St. *Paul*. In which place it is yet obſervable, that this foul-mouthed Railer, tho' deſirous to muſter up all the Objections he could againſt Chriſtianity, as Renegades are wont to do, againſt the Perſons and Doctrines they have left, ſpeaks not a Word of St. *Peter*'s Supremacy; but * ſought rather to accuſe him of Misbehaviour or Error; Of which you have no reaſon to be proud. And yet if he had ſpoken of it, this would never have anſwered your Deſign of ſhewing that St. *Peter*'s Supremacy was notoriouſly known amongſt the Heathens. Inaſmuch as had it been true, it might have been known to *Porphyry*, tho' to few others of the Heathens, becauſe being an Apoſtate from Chriſtianity, as not only || *Nicephorus* teſtifies, but * St. *Auguſtin* too, †*Socrates*, he might have been acquainted with it whilſt a Chriſtian, and not have learned it from the Heathens. Thus groſly are you out, not only in your Teſtimony, but likewiſe in your Inference from it; which I hope is abundantly enough to ſet them both aſide.

Reſt. What have you to offer againſt my following Arguments?

Vind. You argue from a charitable Advice, to a Parent, and a Right of fairly and dutifully repreſenting a Prince's Crimes to him, for a Liberty to withſtand our higheſt Superiors, and even the principal Governor and Head of the whole Church. Which you muſt own not to be a right method of Procedure. For there is a vaſt Difference between humbly petitioning, or even dutifully remonſtrating to a Superior, to whom we think our

---

* Volens illi maculam inurere.
|| *E. H. l.* 10. *c.* 36.
* De civ. Dei. *l.* 10. *c.* 28.
† Socrat. Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 3. *c.* 23.

ſelves

ſelves obliged ſubmiſſively to repreſent his Miſtakes or Faults, and boldly withſtanding and reproving him for them. And it is not fair, from the Uſage of the one, to infer the Lawfulneſs and Decency of the other. What you ſay of a Prieſt's ſtanding up, and bearing Teſtimony againſt his heretical Biſhop, is more to your purpoſe, but does not come up to it. For every Prieſt is bound, as he ſhall have Ability and Occaſion, *to contend earneſtly for the Faith*; but withal if it be againſt his Biſhop, or other lawful Superior, he muſt do it in a much more reſpectful manner, than St. *Paul* ſeems to have uſed towards this Apoſtle. So that upon the whole, you have no way invalidated our Author's Argument from St. *Paul*'s withſtanding St. *Peter* to the face, in ſuch a manner as he could not have allowed himſelf to uſe, had he known him to be the Prince of the Apoſtles, the Vicar of Chriſt, and Head of his Univerſal Church.

Reſt. I hope you will not charge me with not having duely anſwered your Author's next Argument, from St. *Paul*'s having *the Care of all the Churches upon him*, and giving out Orders for *all Churches*. This he boaſts of, and ſays, *There is nothing that is ſaid of St.* Peter, *is ſo expreſs as what St.* Paul *ſays of himſelf* in this reſpect. And *this*, I have told him, * *is a bold Affirmation*, and wants *Proof to back it.*

Vind. But now if I ſhould ask, what Proof you have againſt him, what could you ſay for your ſelf?

Reſt. I muſt tell you, as I do him, *it has been anſwered often, and he takes no notice of it.*

Vind. If it has been ſo often anſwered, it will be the more eaſily anſwered now.

---

* *C. R. p.* 11.

Reſt.

Reſt. My Anſwer then is this. *By the Care of all the Churches* is meant * of thoſe Churches only which were planted by himſelf; and it was to theſe only he ordained what he thought fit.

Vind. And is this your way of Anſwering? The Apoſtle poſitively declares, *the Care of all the Churches came upon him daily*; and you tell him no, it was only of ſome particular Churches, which he himſelf had planted. He ſays, *ſo ordain I in all the Churches*; and here again you contradict him, and tell him he had nothing to do, to iſſue forth his Orders for any but thoſe under his more immediate Inſpection. As if St. *Paul* did not underſtand his own Buſineſs, and the Extent of his Power, 'til you came to direct him, and ſettle it for him. I am well aſſured our Author was in the right, when he ſaid; *If ſuch a Decretal could be produced of St.* Peter's, *I doubt not it would have been made uſe of, towards proving his Univerſal Supremacy.* And have often thought, if theſe Words had been ſpoken by St. *Peter*, what a Noiſe we ſhould have had in our Ears with them. But being ſpoken by the great Apoſtle of the Gentiles, they are to ſignify nothing. They conſiſt not well with St. *Peter's*

---

* *See how this agrees with the Doctrine of Theodoret.* Ἑβραίοις γὰρ γεγράφων, ὧν ἐκ ἐπεχείρει τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν. Præf. in Ep. ad *Hebr.* Διὸ γὰρ τὴν περὶ ἄλλων Ἀποστόλων προμήθειαν ἐτέλει. Ibid. Again, Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλει, πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη ἀποστελεῖς. Ibid. *To the ſame effect ſpeaks,* Clement *of* Alexandria, apud Euſeb. *H. E. l.* 6. *c.* 14. Οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων Ἀπόστολον διά τε τὴν πρὸς τὸ κύριον τιμὴν, διά τε τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ πίστις Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐθνῶν κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ Ἀποστολον. *And* Oecumenius *ſince,* Arg. Epiſt. ad Hebr. Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν γινόμενος καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀποστελεὶς, κηρύττει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον· γεγράφας τε πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, γράφει λοιπὸν καὶ τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πεπιστευκόσιν Ἑβραίοις.

pre-

pretended Supremacy, which must not be meddled with upon whatever Terms, and therefore it is a Vanity to insist upon them. And yet after all they are the Words of Holy Scripture, and to be relyed upon, incomparably beyond all your groundless Imaginations and Conceits. And they suit excellently well with the Order given to all the Apostles to go, and *teach*, or rather * make Disciples of *all Nations*, all Parts of the World whereever they should come. To this end, our Blessed Saviour not only † *sent them, as his Father had sent him, but* || *when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.* Their Commission you see was General, and of large Extent, not confining any of them to any particular District or Dioceſs. And no wonder therefore if they had an unlimited Concern for all Christians in whatever Part of the Earth, and gave out their Orders for the Direction of any they had Opportunity of visiting, or sending to, by whomsoever first planted. And if you are resolved to have it otherwise, I must desire to know the Grounds of such your Resolution. Such a Commission as St. *Peter* had, such had also St. *Paul*, together with the rest of the Apostles; but that any one of them had any peculiar Dioceſe, otherwise than by Agreement amongst themselves, you may assert as confidently as you please, but will never be able to make it out. And yet I am not come up to what our Author intended. For he does not say the fore-mentioned Words declare St. *Paul* to have had any proper Jurisdiction over

---

* Μαθητεύσατε. *St.* Matth. xxviii. 19.
† *St.* John xx. 21. || *Verse* 22, 23.

all

all Churches, beyond what the other Apoſtles had; but that had any thing of this Nature been ſaid of St. *Peter, he doubted not but it would have been made uſe of, towards proving his Univerſal Supremacy.* And if he had pleaſed, he might have added, it would have been made more uſe of to that purpoſe, than all the whole New Teſtament beſides. And what Anſwer can you give to this? Do you deny it? By no means. On the contrary you undertake to juſtify ſuch an Application, would the Caſe have born it. *May not the ſame Words,* ſay you, * *be uſed to ſignify a King's Power, and a Magiſtrate's? Yet the King's Power implies Independence, and the Magiſtrate's Subordination.* An apparent Acknowledgment that had theſe Words been on your ſide, you would have been ſure to make uſe of them, for the ſupport of your pretended Supremacy. Which is all he charged you with. And yet again, Power and Authority, you ſay, ſignify differently when applied to a Sovereign, and when to a Magiſtrate. About which Diſtinction I will not diſpute with you; but only ſhall tell you, that to make it applicable to your purpoſe, you are firſt to prove St. *Peter* really had that Supremacy you would enſtate him in, and St. *Paul* was an Inferior Agent under him, before you conclude their Powers to have been thus different. I add, that what I here offer in behalf of St. *Paul,* St. *Chryſoſtom* affirms of Biſhops in general, and is therefore more apparently indiſputable in behalf of St. *Paul,* or any other Apoſtle; that † *every Biſhop ought to take care,* [as he has opportunity,] *not only of his own Church,* [or Dioceſe] *but of the whole Church diſperſed throughout the World.* This that eminent Father teaches; and you may diſprove it if you can, and may

* *C. R. p.* 12.

† *Tom.* 5. Orat. 93. *p.* 631.

try to convince both him, and St. *Paul* of Falſhood.

Reſt. * *We own that the Gentiles were St.* Paul's *peculiar Charge, but with ſubordination to the Supreme Paſtor.*

Vind. What you own, as to St. *Paul*'s being the Apoſtle of the Gentiles, we own too. But then your ſuppoſed Subordination we deny; and I hope I have competently diſproved it already, though that was more than I was any way obliged to, the Proof of it lying properly upon you. But if I will wait for that, I find I may wait till Doomſday; for you are rather for ſuppoſing than proving it.

Reſt. The ſame Conjecture your Author has, about what is ſaid of St. *James* in the Synod at *Jeruſalem*, and I make the ſame Reply I do here, that † *Words may have a different Signification, according to the Perſons they are applied to.*

Vind. And my Anſwer will therefore ſerve here too, that before you go to affix ſuch *a different Signification*, you ought clearly and evidently to prove, the Difference between the Perſons to whom you apply them.

Reſt. I have told my thoughts of the matter ſeveral times.

Vind. I preſume you do not take upon your ſelf, to have a Power of determining all Controverſies. It is your Arguments, not your Thoughts I call for.

Reſt. * *The Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles has enough in it, to convince any unprejudiced Perſon, of St.* Peter's *Supremacy.*

---

* *C. R. p.* 14.
* *C. R. p.* 18.

† *Pag.* 19.

Vind. As

Vind. As how?

Reſt. I. *It gives him always the firſt Place.*

Vind. This denotes only a Primacy of Order, and Reſpect, as he was the eldeſt Apoſtle, the firſt that came, and thenceforward ſtayed conſtantly with our Lord. Which might very well be, and actually was without any Supremacy over the reſt. In like manner as in our Houſe of Lords the Prince of *Wales*, when there is one, takes place of all the reſt, but this Precedence gives him no Sovereignty over them.

Reſt. II. *He propoſes firſt the Election of a new Apoſtle.*

Vind. And what if St. *Thomas*, or St. *Bartholomew* had made that Propoſal? Wou'd this have given either of them a Supremacy over the reſt? You cannot pretend it. And yet if this Obſervation ſignify any thing, it muſt neceſſarily have done it.

Reſt. III. *After the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, he firſt Preaches to the Jews.*

Vind. This was in purſuance of our Saviour's Promiſe, of building his Church upon him, if he were really the Rock on which it was to be built, as ſome have thought. Beſides, has our Saviour any where promiſed, that whoſoever Preached firſt to the People, ſhould have a Supremacy over his whole Church? If he has, produce the Promiſe. If he has not, as you know he has not, be ingenuous, and own your Error, in claiming ſo tranſcendent a Privilege, without any Promiſe whereupon to found your Claim.

Reſt. IV. *He works the firſt Miracle in confirmation of the Goſpel.*

Vind. But where is the Univerſal Supremacy promiſed to him, that ſhould work the firſt Mira-

cle, any more than to him that ſhould firſt Preach the Goſpel to the *Jews?*

Reſt. V. *He firſt Preaches to the Gentiles.*

Vind. This I have before noted to be thought by ſome, to be the Completion of our Saviour's Prediction of building his Church upon him. But neither this, nor his Preaching firſt to the *Jews*, nor both of them together; has any the leaſt Intimation annext to it, or them, of the Supremacy you are ſo fond of, and which you would with all your heart prove to belong to him, but that you cannot.

Reſt. VI. *He is the firſt to whom their Vocation was revealed.*

Vind. Ergo he had an Univerſal Supremacy. This is ſuch trifling I am aſhamed of it. And I cannot but wonder, what Opinion you have of our Underſtandings, that you can think it ſhould ever paſs with us for arguing. All I can collect from ſuch poor Impertinent Suggeſtions, as you have here heaped together, is only this, that you would ſay ſomething to the purpoſe, but you find the Caſe defenceleſs, and cannot.

Reſt. Now I think I ſhall do your Buſineſs effectually.

Vind. Then I hope you have ſome better Argument in ſtore, than any of theſe foregoing uſeleſs Obſervations.

Reſt. VII. *He is the firſt that gives a definitive Sentence, in the Council at* Jeruſalem.

Vind. Can you make that out? And if you could, would that prove an Univerſal Supremacy?

Reſt. Do you doubt it?

Vind. Firſt, How do you make good your Aſſertion, that St. *Peter* gave the definitive Sentence amongſt the Apoſtles?

Reſt. Will you not believe your Eyes?

Vind. You

Vind. You will not always permit me to do it; witneſs Tranſubſtantiation. But what do my Eyes tell me, that this Apoſtle ſpake firſt in that Council?

Reſt. Moſt certainly.

Vind. But does his ſpeaking firſt ſhew that he gave the firſt definitive Sentence. If he gave no definitive Sentence, he did not give a Firſt.

Reſt. Why, Do you queſtion that?

Vind. And ſo muſt you too, if you will be perſuaded carefully to attend to what he ſaid. He declared, * that God had made him the happy Inſtrument, of firſt publiſhing the Goſpel to the *Gentiles*, and ſince they were become Converts to Chriſtianity, and had received the Holy Ghoſt, he did not ſee what reaſon there could be, to require of them the Obſervation of the *Moſaick* Law, by which they could not hope to be juſtified, but only by Faith in Chriſt, and Obedience to his Goſpel.

Reſt. Is not this a definitive Sentence?

Vind. No ſure; it looks more like a Propoſal at the Opening of the Seſſion. And ſo I ſhould have thought it, but that we are told there had *been much diſputing* before. Yet it certainly comes too ſoon for a definitive Sentence. For what Preſident of any tolerable Underſtanding and Integrity ever gave a definitive Sentence, before the Cauſe was fully heard? Or what need would there be, to debate about it, after the definitive Sentence were given? Yet † after this *Barnabas* and *Paul* ſpake to the ſame purpoſe, tho' not ſo fully; and all this before the definitive Sentence.

Reſt. What is a definitive Sentence, if you will not allow St. *Peter's* to be ſo?

---

* *Acts* xv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. † *V.* 12.

 Vind. That

Vind. That of St. *James*, which follows after the reſt had delivered their Minds, is undeniably a *definitive Sentence.* He declares, * how God had *viſited the Gentiles to take out of them a People for his Name.* And when the others had been heard, like the Preſident of an Aſſembly, he concludes all with his Determination, according to the Opinion of thoſe who had ſpoken before him; but more fully and particularly, and in ſuch a manner, that they all ſeem readily and unanimouſly to have acquieſced in it, and conſented to it. And here it is obſervable. 1. He gave his Sentence laſt, as the Reſult of their Debates, which St. *Peter* did not. 2. He did it in an Authoritative manner, and as became one in his Station. Κείνω, ſays he, as our Tranſlation rightly has it, *my Sentence*, or Determination *is*.

Reſt. You know I do not allow of your Tranſlation, but blame your Author, for being led into an Error by it, and demand of him to *prove*, that that Verb *has no other Signification, than what your Bible gives it.*

Vind. This is to miſlead your Reader, and carry him off from the Point you were upon. For the proper Queſtion is not, whether this be the only Signification of the Verb Κείνω, but whether it be not as true and genuine a Signification as any it has. And this you do not pretend to contradict, becauſe you know you cannot, and would abundantly ſhame your ſelf if you ſhould attempt it. Nay, in this very ſame Page you plainly acknowledge it, only you would not have it thought to ſignify ſo here, becauſe it is not for your purpoſe that it ſhould. So that your finding fault with our Tranſlation, ſhews only your good Inclina-

* *Verſe* 13, &c.

tion

tion towards it, and that you would pick a quarrel with it if you could tell how; but does not at all invalidate what our Author has said. 3. St. *James*'s Determination, not St. *Peter*'s, was what they all agreed in: For so was the Decree of the Council; * *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden, than these necessary things, that ye abstain from Meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things strangled, and from Fornication*, the self same particulars whereof St. *James*'s Determination consisted. Here is plain Proof that it was St. *James*, and none other of the Apostles that presided in, and put an end to that Council. And now tell me sincerely, my good Friend, what is become of all your Observations from *the Acts of the Apostles*? The rest of them signify nothing to the Disquisition we are upon; and this, which alone is to the Point, is false and not to be maintained. Nor is this my Doctrine only, but what the great St. *Chrysostom* has taught long before me, testifying of St. *James*, that ἐκεῖνος ὢν ὁ ἀρχὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος, † *he was invested with the chief Power there*, contrary to your Conceit of St. *Peter*'s Presidency amongst them. And not only so, but a little after, St. *Peter*, says he, *delivered himself with the greater earnestness, but this Apostle the more sedately*, ‖ *as it always becomes those in greater Power to do.* And again, Τί ὁ κύριος ἐγώ. *What is this, I determine, or my Sentence is?* ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' ἐξουσίας λέγω τοῦτο· namely, as much as to say, *I speak this Authoritatively.* Thus undeniably is this Venerable Father an Advocate for our Translation, and thus expressly does he declare for St. *James*'s presiding, and having the chief Power in

---

* *V.* 28, 29. † In loc.

‖ Οὕτως ἀεὶ χρὴ τὸν ἐν μεγάλῃ δυναστείᾳ πεπιστευμένον.

that Synod. The same also says *Hesychius* of *Jerusalem* * Πέτρος δημηγορεῖ, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ, &c. Peter *speeches it, but St.* James *determines---- and his Determination was not to be set aside, nor his Sentence to be slighted.* And you will find it to very little purpose, to set up your groundless Fancies against the Authority of such Men, and the plain Evidence I have brought against you. You may go on, if you like it, and say as you do, † *That St.* James, *as President, gave his definitive Sentence, is most false, is most untrue.* But I have now shewn fully, that it is most true, and your Complaint of our Translators, is groundless, and highly unreasonable. Whence it follows, that this Assertion, after all your sly endeavours to evade it, *is a strong,* and invincible *Argument against St.* Peter's *Primacy,* if by Primacy you mean the Supremacy you have been pleading for.

Rest. It is time now to call another Cause.

Vind. Let me beg a Word or two more with you first as to this.

Rest. I thought you had shot all your Powder by this time.

Vind. Then I must let you know, I have not. Neither can I dismiss it without my former Question, what Promise have you, that he who should Preside in this Council, should be supreme Pastor of the whole Church? Or what other Title to this Supremacy can you plead, from what was said, or acted therein? It is matter of Fact, that you will not allow St. *James* such a supereminent Jurisdiction, tho' I have proved him to have presided there. And it is too much to expect, it to be yielded to St. *Peter,* whom I have proved to

---

* Phot. Biblioth. CCLXXV. *pag.* 1526.
† *C. R. pag.* 19, 20.

have

have been and acted there, only as a Fellow-Apoſtle.

Reſt. Have you done yet?

Vind. Before I anſwer you pray tell me, whether you have any thing farther to urge for this Supremacy, either from Scripture, or Tradition?

Reſt. Not at this time.

Vind. Then let me put another Queſtion, and be ſo kind as to return me an ingenuous Anſwer to it. Suppoſing St. *Peter* had in truth had ſuch an unlimited Supremacy as you imagine, how would you prove the Pope to have the ſame?

Reſt. It deſcends to him as the Succeſſor of St. *Peter.*

Vind. Do you take this to be Proof? St. *Peter* had ſome extraordinary Powers as an Apoſtle, which were to dye with him, as well as others that were to deſcend to ſuch as ſhould come after him; and how ſhall I know that this Supremacy was not one of the former ſort?

Reſt. I take that for granted.

Vind. So I ſuppoſe, becauſe I am ſure you have no way proved it. Well, but let me ask you again, if St. *Peter* had ſuch a Supremacy, how came he to leave it any more to *Rome*, than to *Antioch*? Your ſelves own he was Biſhop there, before he was at *Rome*, and for divers Years together, for Seven Years ſays your Hiſtorian * *Baronius.* And how came it to paſs, he did not leave that See as much Supreme in the Eaſtern, as that of *Rome*, in the Weſtern part of the World? What Evidence is there of his deſigning ſo vaſt a Diſproportion between his Two Succeſſors? Or how does it appear, that he might leave his Supremacy where he would? By what Charter might his Succeſſors

* Annal. Tom. 1. 39. 21.

at

at *Rome* claim a Supremacy over, not only those at *Antioch*, but even over St. *John* and any other of the Apostles, if any were permitted to out-live St. *Peter*? These are such Absurdities, that it is much better presuming them, than attempting the Proof of them. And yet till these, and divers other like Enquiries are satisfactorily resolved, that Universal Supremacy, upon which you so unwarrantably value your selves, must unavoidably stand but in a tottering Condition.

Rest. In your Opinion.

Vind. And in the Opinion of all understanding and impartial Judges, and some of your own Communion, and of eminent Station amongst you, and even of the Highest.

Rest. So you make your People believe.

Vind. And so have some of yours believed and taught. Take this instance for the present, from the Author of a Discourse, entituled, *Moyens sures & Honestes pour la Conversion des tous les Heretiques*, Printed at *Cologne* in the Year 1681.

Rest. What says he?

Vind. He says * Cardinal *Cusanus* confirms what St. *Gregory* had told us before. *We read*, says the Cardinal, † *that the Three first Patriarchs, of* Rome, *of* Alexandria, *and of* Antioch, *and together with these all the Bishops that were under them, sate in St.* Peter's *Chair.* And as if this were not enough, that Author adds, *Que l'on lise les écrites de Gregoire, &c. Let any one read the Writings of the Popes,* Gregory, Gelasius, *and* Leo, *and he will find they all acknowledge all good Bishops to be St.* Peter's *Successors, and tho' sometimes they have not fail'd to discover ambitious Inclinations, and a desire of subjecting other Bishops to them, yet not as Heads of the Church, and yet*

* Tom. 1. *p.* 67, 68. † Cus. *l.* 1. *c.* 14.

less

less by virtue of any Text of Scripture. Neither is it to be observed for the first Five Centuries, that any ever had the Face to alledge one single Passage in the sacred Writings, for establishing the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

Rest. Have you done now?

Vind. I thought I had: But another like Passage comes in my way; and it is of your great Champion *Bellarmin*, who after he had sifted this Point as thoroughly, and been as zealous and industrious in maintaining and establishing it, as any one of your Party ever was, is yet forced to admit, that * *the Scriptures do no where expressly declare the Bishop of* Rome, *to be St.* Peter's *Successor.* And if so, much less do they any where invest him with an Universal Supremacy over the Church of Christ. But enough of this.

Rest. † Your Author argues against this Supremacy, from the Civil States, and the several Governments of the World.

Vind. The several Pages you spend upon this Topick I might well pass over, as of no concern to us, because you all along proceed upon a Supposition of that Supremacy, which it were your business to prove, if you could, and which I hope I have clearly disproved. The main of your Argument lies in this, that a single Universal Monarch must in all appearance govern the Church best. And to prove this, as our Author argues against it from the Civil State, so do you for it. And particularly from the times of *Augustus*, in which you say was greater Peace than *since the Division of the Empire.* Against which Doctrine of yours a late Learned || Author has undertaken to

---

* De Rom. Pontif. *l.* 2. *c.* 12. † *C. R. p.* 22. &c.

|| Jani templum Christo nascente reseratum, Authore *Joanne Musson* M. A.

prove,

prove, there was not so constant and lasting a Peace through the Empire in his time as is commonly supposed. And yet were your Supposition taken for truth, you seem to have forgot that the Growth of the Empire was at length the Cause of its own Destruction. This not only * *Horace* testifies, but † *Florus* and ‖ *Livy*, and * *Tacitus*, and besides these † St. *Augustine*.

Rest. You say you have disproved the Supremacy we contend for.

Vind. Yes, and might have done it much more largely had I thought it necessary. And yet I have one Observation still behind, in relation to this Supremacy: Namely, that we have very good Evidence against it. It not only has no Foundation, either in Scripture or Primitive Antiquity, but we meet with such Occurrences in the Ancient Writers, as manifest it to have been perfectly unknown in their Times.

Rest. Pray let us hear some of them.

Vind. In the first place, see with what singular Familiarity, the other Bishops then treated the Bishop of *Rome*; how they addressed themselves to him as a Fellow-Bishop, not as to a Supreme Governor over them all. How oft do they, and others, call him ‖ *Collegue*, * *Brother*, † *most dear Brother, or most beloved Pope*, or Bishop, for ‖ so

---

* L. V. Od. xvi. ad *Romanos*. † L. 3. c. 12.
‖ L. 1. Exord. * L. 2. Histor. p. 347, 348.
† De Civ. Dei, 1. 18. c. 45
‖ Vinc. Lir. Common. p. 323. Edit. Baluz. B. Cypr. Ep. 9, &. 55.
* Id. Ep. 44, 45, 47, 48, 60, & alibi passim.
† Gest. Purgat. Cecil. & Fel. p. 98, 99. B. Hieron. c. Lucif. Ep. 58. c. 9.
‖ B. Cypr. Ep. 8, 23, 30, 31, 36. B. *Aug.* ep. 11, 13, 14, 31. B. *Hieron.* ad Pammach. ep. 61. B. Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 759.

the

the Word then ſignified, * *Fellow Miniſter*, and again barely † *Biſhop of the Romans? Firmilian* of *Cappadocia* makes no difficulty, to tax Pope *Stephen*, || with *open and manifeſt Folly*. St. *Cyprian* in the Council of *Carthage*, declares againſt an univerſally Supreme, as no way agreeable to the Chriſtian Church. *None of us*, ſay he, * *makes himſelf a Biſhop of Biſhops, or compells his Collegues by a Tyrannical Terror, to a neceſſity of obeying, ſeeing every Biſhop is at his own diſpoſal, according to the Extent of his Liberty and Power, and can no more be judged by another, than he can judge another.* St. *Auguſtin* ſeems to have apprehended no ſuch Difference between the fore-named *Stephen* and St. *Cyprian*, when he ſays † *They were Two Biſhops of moſt eminent Churches, the Roman and the Carthaginian.* I have noted before how loudly Pope *Gregory* the Great declaimed againſt an Univerſal Biſhop, as the Forerunner of Antichriſt; and that the Council of *Chalcedon* allotted the Primacy of Order to the See of *Rome*, not becauſe the Biſhop there was Univerſal Paſtor; but becauſe *Rome* had a greater regard due to it, as being the Imperial City; and the ſecond Place to *Conſtantinople*, as a ſort of *New Rome*. And thus it is ordered likewiſe in *Juſtinian*'s Novels. Θεσπίζομεν κ. τ. λ. &c. || *We decree according to the Deciſions of the Four Holy Councils, that the moſt holy Pope of Old* Rome *take place of all other Biſhops; and the moſt bleſſed Archbiſhop of* Conſtantinople, *the New* Rome, *hold the ſecond Rank, and be preferred before all others.* which Conſtitutions I take to explain that of * *Irenæus*, that

---

* Συλλειτουργὸν, Euſeb. H. E. l. 7. c. 30. Socrat. l. 4. c. 12. Concil. Chalced. Epiſt. vi. Theodorit. H. E. l. 5. c. 8.
† Geſt. Purgat. *ubi ſupra.* || Apud B. Cypr. Ep. 75.
* P. 229. † De unico Baptiſm. c. 14.
|| Nov. 131. * Adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 3.

the

the Faithful all about flocked to *Rome*, *propter potentiorem Principalitatem*, becauſe of the peculiar Power and Privileges that belonged to it; not by any Divine Right, but as given it by * Councils, and † Emperors. I take alſo the ſixth Canon of the great *Nicene* Council to be very appoſite to our purpoſe, which gives the Biſhops of *Alexandria* Power over *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Pentapolis*, in like manner as the *Biſhop of* Rome *has over the Subjects of his See*. Which muſt neceſſarily imply the *Roman* Biſhop, ‖ to have a limited Juriſdiction, confined to his own Patriarchate, inaſmuch as otherwiſe it could not be like that of the *Alexandrian*, and other Eaſtern Patriarchs. Nor ought the Teſtimony of St. *Jerom* to *Evagrius*, oppoſite enough to ſuch an extravagant Demand as this is, to be forgotten. * *Ubicunque fuerit Epiſcopus, ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubii*, &c. *Whereſoever there be a Biſhop, whether at the* magnificent City of *Rome*, or the little *Eugubium*, at flouriſhing *Conſtantinople*, or diſregarded *Rhegium*, at renowned *Alexandria*, or the obſcurer *Tanis*, *he is of the ſame Merit and Prieſthood. The Power of Riches, and the Meanneſs of Poverty, does not make a Biſhop either Higher, or Lower. But they are all Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.* Which words cannot be wreſted ſo as to make it probable, that St. *Jerom* thought one Apoſtle to have been by Divine Inſtitution, Superior or Inferior to any of his Brethren. And this St. *Cyprian* poſitively atteſts, † *Hoc erant cæteri Apoſtoli, quod fuit Petrus*, &c. *What* Peter *was the ſame alſo were the other Apoſtles, endued with a like Partnerſhip of Honour and Power.* And if the Apoſtles were all of like Power and Authority,

---

*. *As but now ſhewn.* † Vid. Platin. in vit. Bonifac. 3.
‖ Vid. Balſ. Zon. & Ariſt. * Ep. 85.
† De Unit. Eccl.

none

none of their Succeſſors, as ſuch, can claim a Superiority over any of their other Fellow-Biſhops. This Poſition St. *Jerome* has here laid down; and it is beſides a natural Inference, from the foregoing Words of St. *Cyprian*. And yet farther, had the Popes been anciently owned as Supreme Governors of the Church, they would have had the Right of Convening General Councils, * which it is certain they had not; they would have Preſided in all of them, and more eſpecially in the firſt and moſt venerable amongſt them, † which yet they did not; and would at laſt have had the ſole Power of confirming their Decrees; ‖ but this they had not. Appeals from all Places would

---

* *Vid. Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. l. 3. c. 6. Theod. H. E. l. 1. c. 7. l. 2. c. 8. l. 4. c. 7. l. 5. c. 9. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. l. 5. in Proem. Sozom. l. 1. c. 17. l. 7. c. 7. Evagr. l. 1. c. 3. l. 2. c. 2. Leo. Pap. Epiſt. 9. ad Theodoſ. Imp. Conc. Nic. l. 1. c. 1. p. 105, & l. 2. c. 5. p. 154, 155. Conc. Conſtant. p. 945. Conc. Epheſ. Act. 1. p. 446. Conc. Chalced. Act. 3. p. 389, & 461, & Act. 11. p. 684, & Par. 3. c. 2. p. 833. Du Pin de Antiq. Eccl. Diſcipl. Diſſertat. 4. p. 336. & Nouv. Biblioth. Edit. Batav. To. 2. p. 318. & To. 4. p. 83, 292, 319, 334, 337. Richer. Hiſt. Conc. gen. l. 1. c. 2. n. 2, 3. c. 5. n. 1. c. 8. n. 10, 11, 12, 13. Queſnel. Diſſert. 1. de vit. & reb. geſt. Leonis M. p. 292. Caſaub. de Libert. Eccl. p. 195. Edit. 4to.*

† Richerius *concludes all the Patriarchs to have Preſided in the* Nicene *Council.* Hiſt. Conc. Gen. *l. 1. c. 2. n. 8. Others relate that* Hoſius did, *and it is viſible that his Name ſtands at the Head of the Subſcriptions, and* Victor *and* Vincentius *the Pope's Legates next after him. Concil.* Labb. *and* Coſſart. *To. 2. p. 50. Thus much* Baronius *owns; only he would needs have* Hoſius *to be the Pope's Legate.* Annal. *To. 3. Ann. 325. 20. But without any good Authority, the Hiſtorians of thoſe times giving no intimation of any ſuch Subſtitution. So* Nectarius *of* Conſtantinople *ſubſcribed firſt to the Council held at that City.* Conc. Conſtantin. *p. 555. And* Cyril *at* Epheſus. *p. 690.* Κεφαλὴ τῶν ἁγιωτάτων ἐπισκόπων Κύριλλος. *Relat. Act. Epheſ. c. 60. See alſo* Sozom. *l. 7. c. 7.* Evagr. *l. 2. c. 18.* Phot. *Epiſt. ad* Mich. Bulgar. Princ. *Richer. l. 1. c. 7. n. 5. Du Pin Nouv. Bibl. To. 2. p. 318, & p. 345.*

‖ *Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. l. 1. c. 37. Sozom. l. 7. c. 9. Juſtell. Cod. Can. & c. To. 1. p. 310.*

have

have been constantly held, to have of right belonged to them, * but they were not. Divers other Objections might likewise be brought against this pretended Supremacy, and much ampler Proof of what is here said, but that I am unwilling to swell this Answer to too great a length. For which reason I refer any one who desires fuller satisfaction, in this Controversy, to the Learned Dr. *Barrow*'s impregnable Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy. A Book that highly deserves to have been translated, into other Languages, for the Benefit of Foreigners, most of whom are now wholly unacquainted with it, or not capable of understanding it.

Rest. I have told you, † this is one of those Books which *have had all the most considerable things in them throughly answered, many Years before the Authors of them were born.*

Vind. Why then may they not be answered, now the Authors of them have been so long dead? They stand as so many lasting Monuments of Reproach to your Party, in that they have so effectually evinced the great Unreasonableness and Falsity of your Religion, and not one amongst you all has had the Courage, in a series of so many Years, to confute them; and yet ye will not yield your selves convinced.

Rest. Have a little patience, I have given my Word, that || *I shall prove all the Objections worth any*

---

* *B.* Cypr. *Ep.* 59. *p.* 136, 137. *Can. Apost.* 37. *Conc. Nic. Can.* 5. *Conc. Constantinop. Can.* 2. *&* 6. *Conc. Antioch. Can.* 15. *Conc. Chalced. Can.* 9. *&* 17. *Conc.* Carthag. *Can.* 31. *una cum notis Balf. Zon. & Arist. Conc.* Milev 2. *Can.* 22. *B.* Aug. *Ep.* 162. Sozom. *H. E. l.* 8. *c.* 26. Socrat. *l.* 2. *c.*20. Du Pin *Nouv. Bibl. to.* 1. *p.*218. *& de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl. Dissertat.* 2. *cap.* 1. §.1, 2, 3, 4. &c.

† *C. R. p.* 98.

|| Ibid.

notice

notice in them, to have been thoroughly answered long ago.

Vind. I will wait for your notable Performance; and if you please you may begin with this *Treatise* of Dr. *Barrow*. But I would advise you as a Friend to beware of such a difficult Undertaking, least it happen to you, as it did several Years since to a Convent in *Portugal*, who had agreed amongst themselves to answer Bishop *Stillingfleet*'s excellent Vindication of Archbishop *Laud*'s Conference with *Fisher*, but when they had gone about half way, found their Task too hard for them, and so were forced to desist. And if you will venture upon it, when your hand is in, you would do well to answer some of your own Writers too. And particularly *Scotus* in 4. dist. 24. *Cordubensis* l. 4. q. 1. *Cajetanus* de Primatu Papæ. *Bannes* in 2. quæst. 1. art. 10. whom you will find to give their Opinion against you. *

Rest. Your Author gives you a *goodly Notion* of the Unity of the Church.

Vind. Hold Sir, I perceive that but Two Pages forward, you recur to the Supremacy; and therefore if you please, we will go on with that a little farther, before we come to your *goodly Notion.*

Rest. I tell you then, *the Ancient Fathers were thorowpac'd Papists, as every one knows.*

Vind. Can you prove, what you say *every one knows?*

Rest. I give you Two Authorities for it, and tell you, I have a great many more in reserve.

Vind. Do these two say, *every one knows* all the rest were of their mind?

Rest. I do not say that; but only that by these

---

* *Du Pin de Antiq. Eccl. Disciplin Dissert.* 4. *p.* 334.
† *C. S. p.* 14.

whom I name, and those others which you are to guess at, the Case is so plain that you must be unreasonable, if you will not allow that *every one knows it.*

Vind. How does that appear?

Rest. I could have made it appear, and * *could have quoted many of the Fathers upon this matter, but for brevity sake I only mention two of great Authority,* St. Prosper, *and* St. Leo. And what can you say to these two?

Vind. As to your Flourish of many more, so long as none of them make their appearance, I have nothing to say. But as to these *Two* I answer first, to prove from hence the Universal Consent of the Writers of those times, is a sort of Deduction you will not allow of in another. As I shall easily make apparent. I have cited St. *Cyprian,* and St. *Jerom,* Two Fathers of far greater Character, for their Writings than yours, to give Testimony against your *Romish* Supremacy; and tho' they do it very fully, and tho' moreover I have produced divers other Fathers, as also some of your own Writers to corroborate their Evidence; I am perswaded you will not admit of this as sufficient Proof, that the Ancient Fathers were all Antipapists. And yet unless you will allow my many more, and more pertinent Testimonies to prove for the generality of the Ancient Fathers, there is no Reason to expect I should allow your much fewer, and less pertinent. But farther, as to your two Authorities; I observe the first is out of a Poem, of *Prosper Aquitanicus,* and the other out of a Panegyrick of Pope *Leo*; and *Poets* and *Panegyrists* being wont frequently to give a loose to their Phancies, you cannot build

---

* *C. R. p.* 28.

much

much upon a particular Phraſe or Expreſſion in them. And accordingly, their unuſual Flights are never to be reckoned upon, as of equal Authority, with the plain Expreſſions of graver and more inſtructive Writers. But to proceed yet farther, and conſider theſe Paſſages more particularly; The Words of your Citation out of *Proſper* are theſe, as you render them in *Engliſh*. *Rome*, Peter's *Seat*, *which to the World is made the Head of Paſtoral Honour. Whatever ſhe does not poſſeſs by Arms, ſhe poſſeſſes in Religion.* And what would you now infer from this, to prove *the Ancient Fathers were thorow pac'd Papiſts?*

Reſt. Here you ſee, if you be not willfully blind, *Rome* is declared to be made *the Head of Paſtoral Honour.*

Vind. But how, or by whom made ſo?

Reſt. By being St. *Peter's Seat.*

Vind. Prove that. Till you can do it, I muſt ſtick to what I have ſaid and proved, that whatſoever Primacy it has, was given it by the Decrees of Councils, and becauſe of it's being the Imperial City. But none of the Ancient Councils ever gave her that exalted Supremacy ſhe now claims to her ſelf.

Reſt. St. *Leo* aſſerts it very plain.

Vind. But the forementioned Councils do not, nor the early Fathers, nor even your St. *Proſper*, who ſpeaking of *Rome*, ſays indeed, ſhe *is made the Head of Paſtoral Honour*; but does not tell you how.

Reſt. But what think you of St. *Leo?*

Vind. He ſays, I own, *that* Rome *is made by the Holy Seat of St.* Peter, *the Head of the World.* But I know not whether you will meet with the like Expreſſion, in any other Author. *Vincentius Liri-*

nensis, I am sure, * uses this same Phrase of *Caput Orbis*, concerning *Rome* in a Civil Sense, with respect to its Temporal Power: And if one of your own Popes has thought fit to apply it in an Ecclesiastical, and with respect to the State of the Church, and in a Panegyrick too, I trust this will not supersede all the irrefragable Evidence that is brought against it. Especially if it be considered that in this same Discourse from whence your Words are taken, he speaks of such a Parity betwixt St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, as cannot well consist with a Supremacy in the one, and Subjection in the other. And not only so, but Cardinal *Cusanus*, in the Words cited p. 42. affirms of this same *Leo*, that he has freely owned *all good Bishops* to be *the Successors of St.* Peter; and by consequence that this Succession, either conveys no Supremacy, and so the Pope has no Title to it upon this account, or else conveys too much, and so *All good Bishops* must have it. Either of which Suppositions quite overthrows your Hypothesis. But now were I to give you up this Pope, as an avowed Advocate for your Universal Supremacy, the summ of all were only this; that by the Fifth Century you had found one Christian Writer, a *Roman* Bishop, and so speaking for himself, who in a Rhetorical Oration, declared for the Supremacy of St. *Peter's* Seat, and the Glory of *Rome* upon that account. And yet it is well known, that in the next Age *Gregory* the Great, who sate in the same See, and should understand his own Prerogative, as well as *Leo*, when quarrelling with *John* of *Constantinople* inveighs severely against him, for taking upon him to be the Universal Bishop, or Head of the Church, in such terms as must

---

* *Commonit. 2. p. 366.*

inevi-

inevitably have condemned himſelf, had he and his Predeceſſors been guilty of the like Pretence. As I have ſhewn before. And now to conclude this Head; I will only note farther, that Expreſſions of this nature are not to be too much depended upon, leaſt they militate as ſtrongly againſt, as for you. St. *Auguſtine* is expreſly ſtiled * *Summus Chriſti Pontifex*, Chriſt's Supreme, or Chief High Prieſt; which nevertheleſs will not paſs with you for a Proof, that the Univerſal Supremacy was then at *Hippo*. So was † alſo St. *Germain* Biſhop of *Paris* in the Sixth Century ſtiled, by *Venantius Fortunatus*; and St. *Baſil* ‖ not only tells St. *Athanaſius*, that he took care of all the Churches in like manner as of his own, but expreſly affirms, that they fled to him, ὥσπερ ὄντι κορυφῆ τῶν ὅλων, *as the Head of the whole*. The Title to the ſuppoſititious Epiſtle of St. *Clement* to St. *James* runs thus; *Clement to our Lord* James, *Biſhop of Biſhops, Preſident over the Holy Catholick Church at* Jeruſalem, *and ſuch others as are any where ſettled by God's Providence*, &c.

Reſt. Neither this Title, nor the Epiſtle it belongs to, is genuine, as you cannot but own.

Vind. So I told you; but yet I mention it, becauſe unleſs you will ſuppoſe the Author to be infatuated, you muſt believe him to ſpeak in the Language of the Times he wrote in, and that it was not then unuſual to aſcribe theſe exceſſive Titles to other Biſhops, beſides him at *Rome*. And to convince you, theſe high ſtrains, in their Addreſſes to the more eminent Prelates, were not ſo wonderful as you may poſſibly apprehend, take another to a later Biſhop of the ſame Church of

---

* *B. Aug. Ep.* 36. † *Lib.* 11. *Ep.* 13.
‖ *Epiſt.* 52.

Jeruſalem. You may find it in one of *Avitus Vienneſis*'s Epiſtles, publiſhed not many Years ſince, by the Learned Jeſuit *Sirmondus*, in theſe Words. **Exercet Apoſtolatus veſter conceſſos à Divinitate primatus, &c. Your Apoſtleſhip exerciſes the Primacy granted you by God, and ſtudies to let the World ſee, that you poſſeſs the chief Place in the Univerſal Church, not only by Privilege, but by your Merits.* If this had been ſaid of the Biſhop of *Rome*, how would you have pleaſed your ſelves with it? It would have done you more ſervice, than what you have collected from, either *Proſper*, or *Leo*; which ſhews how little ſtreſs is to be laid upon either of their Aſſertions. And now, if you pleaſe, I am at leaſure to attend to your *goodly Notion* you was ſpeaking of.

Reſt. Your Author I ſay, † *gives you a goodly Notion of the Unity of the Church, that it conſiſts in the common Chriſtianity, wherein all agree.*

Vind. And can you diſprove this *goodly Notion*?

Reſt. I have already ſaid, ‖ *If all Sects agree in ſome common Principles of Chriſtianity, tho' they have no Ordination, Sacraments,* &c. *tho' they erect Altar againſt Altar,* &c. *tho' they curſe and damn one another,* &c. *yet according to this Notion, they are true Churches, and in Union with the Catholick Church.*

Vind. In anſwer to this, he has told you, as you know very well; *We muſt keep God's Commandments too*; which they who do not are by no means ſound Members of the one Catholick Church; and this implies an Obſervation of all his Inſtitutions. Thoſe who profeſs to believe in Chriſt, and have been baptized into his Name, are hereby become Members of his Church. But if they behave not themſelves in other reſpects, as becomes their holy Pro-

---

* *Neoc. & Syk. Biblioth. libr. novorum. Vol.* 1. *p.* 279.
† *C. R. p.* 26. ‖ *Ibid.*

feſſion, and particularly if they do not live in a faithful Obedience to their lawful, regular Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, and keep a ſtrict Union with the other Orthodox and orderly Members of the Church, avoiding all Schiſms and unneceſſary Diviſions, they may become putrid gangrened Members, and may come to be cut off, and no way owned by the purer Part of the Church, unleſs upon their ſerious Humiliation and Repentance.

Reſt. Will you pretend to ſay, that ſuch equivocal Chriſtians as theſe, are Members of the Catholick Church?

Vind. I do, and muſt ſay, as *Catholick* moſt naturally and genuinely ſignifies *Univerſal*, they are; tho' unworthy Members of it. But if in the other, Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe of the Word, by the Catholick Church be meant, the Orthodox, pure Part of the Church, who faithfully adhere to Chriſt, and endeavour to live up to the Rules of his Goſpel, and that all in its Communion ſhould do ſo too, I confeſs they are not Members of this Church, nor can hope for any Advantage in order to Salvation, by any pretence of Union with it; but are like Branches cut off from a Tree, that can receive no Juice or Nouriſhment from it, unleſs graffed again into it.

Reſt. I ſee you are for *Obeying Chriſt's Commands*, as well as your Author.

Vind. I hope in God I always ſhall be, whatſoever Temptations I meet with to the contrary. And I heartily wiſh you, and your corrupt Church, were more obſervant of them, than you are in divers reſpects. For you know, * without ſuch Obedience there is no Hope of Salvation.

Reſt. This I ſay, † *is nothing to the purpoſe.*

---

* *St.* Matth. 7. 21. † *C. R. p.* 27.

Vind. You mean it is not for the purpose of your part of the Church, because her Corruptions are so contrary to divers of these Commandments, that she is forced by way of self-defence, to depreciate this principal Test of true Orthodoxy, and set up others of less Certainty, and several of which are in truth no Tests of it at all. But let me tell you; and I am sure I have very good Authority for it, that no Orthodoxy in Faith, tho' that be necessary too, no such Orthodoxy, I say, no Pretence to an Universal Supremacy, no particular Privileges of any one See above another, will be of any avail in order to the Salvation of any, either Person, or Church, that has not a due Regard to the Commandments of God. Which it is certain your Church has not, in the Worship of Images, the Adoration of the Host, Prayers to Saints and Angels, your *Latin* Service, your withholding the Cup in the blessed Eucharist, *&c.* Give me leave therefore to tell you, that your Charge against us, of || *having cut our selves off from you by a causless Separation*, is groundless and false. For first, it cannot be denied, that both Papists and Reformed joyned together in one Communion, for a considerable Part of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, till Pope *Pius* V. issued out a violent Bull, and so made the first Separation; as our Author has * noted before me. And then again, if we had broke off from you first, this could by no means be reputed *a causless Separation*, when your Corruptions were become so gross, that we could with no safety to our Souls comply with them. As has been proved over and over.

Rest. I cannot forbear pitying the poor * *silly*

---

* *Ibid.* † *C. S. p.* 101.

|| *C. R. p.* 27.

Primi-

Primitive Christians, that knew nothing of this Principle!

Vind. If you had pleased, you might have saved your self the trouble, of this senseless, ironical Commiseration. For these *Primitive Christians* were not only for *Obeying God's Commandments*; but were perfect Strangers to your Twelve additional Articles of the modern *Romish* Creed. And had they been now alive, they would no more have dared to communicate with your Church, in her present Circumstances, with the Errors she has entertained and propagated in these latter Ages, and especially since the Council of *Trent*, than we of the Church of *England* dare. Neither is it pretended by any of our Church, that the Hereticks they condemned were true Members, of the Catholick, meaning of the Regular and Orthodox Church; but only in a laxer Sense, that they were unsound Members of the Universal Church, as they were Christians, as you here * avowedly hold them to have been.

Rest. † Your Author says, *All Churches agree in this Summary of our Faith called the Creed; and the Church of* Rome *her self must think this sufficient for Salvation.*

Vind. And what Objection have you against it.

Rest. First, I say, *If this be* sufficient, *then* Papists *are secure, for they admit the Summary.*

Vind. But they have tacked to it Twelve other Articles of their own contriving, and how secure they are in this, deserves your serious Consideration. I cannot yet see why creating new Articles of Faith, unknown to the Scriptures, and the first and best Christians, is not as much Heresy as denying any of the old Ones. I am sure it is an in-

---

* *Ibid.* † *Pag.* 32.

tolerable

tolerable deviation from the only Rule of Faith, and makes your Faith twice as much as our Saviour and his Apoſtles ever made it. And it is for this ſinful Addition to your Faith, together with your unchriſtian Practices conſonant to it, that we dare not aſſociate our ſelves with you.

Reſt. I think I have ſufficiently gravelled your Author here, I ask him whether *the Summary call'd the Creed, be ſufficient for the Salvation of a Man, who poſitively rejects the whole Bible, the Sacraments, and all the Articles of Chriſtianity, not contained in the Summary?*

Vind. By *other Articles* I ſuppoſe you mean, the known Truths of Chriſtianity not contained in the Summary; becauſe you will never be able to maintain that there are any other neceſſary Articles of Faith, purely ſuch. *Petenda* there are, and *Agenda*, Matters of Prayer and Practice, which in a large and *general Senſe are to be believed, becauſe they are revealed.* But what we call the *Credenda* or Articles of Faith, *are revealed, becauſe they are to be believed.* Theſe are of a *Speculative* Nature; and *of theſe the Creed commonly called the* Apoſtles Creed, *is a ſufficient Summary.* As has been noted ſometime ſince by the Learned Dr. *Hickes*, in the ſecond *Collection* of his excellent *Controverſial Letters*, p. 47. Amongſt the *Agenda* come the Sacraments, and ſo are not matters meerly and purely of Faith, as our Author rightly ſuppoſes. But in anſwer to your Inquiry, pray let me ask you again, where there ever was a Man who firmly and ſincerely believed the *Summary* or Creed, and yet denied the other Articles, or rejected the Bible, or Sacraments. When you have done this you may expect an Anſwer. At preſent I ſhall neither trouble you, nor my Reader, with a needleſs Diſpute about a Non-entity.

Reſt.

Reſt. * *The Council of* Trent *has added no new Articles to the* Creed; *and we defy him and all his Party to prove that one new* Article *has been added to the old.*

Vind. A bold Challenge indeed! but ſtrutting and hectoring with ſome People ſupplies the room of Arguments. Do but read over Pope *Pius's* Creed, and you muſt be blind, if you do not ſee good ſtore of new *Articles* in it. For pray Sir, in which of the old Articles are you taught the Supremacy of the Pope, and Maternity of the Roman Church, the Adoration of the Hoſt, the Worſhip of Images, the withholding the Cup in direct contradiction to our Saviour's Inſtitution, Invocation of Saints or Angels, the Doctrines of Tranſubſtantiation, and Purgatory, the Uſe of Indulgences, *&c.* You may read over the *Summary* a Thouſand times, and with all the Diligence and Attention that may be, and yet not be able at laſt to fiſh any one of all theſe Articles out of it. And can any thing be more aſſuming, than yet to challenge your Adverſaries to ſhew any one new Article in your new Creed? Can any thing be more inſincere, than to ſay this is only an Explication of the former Creeds? Good Sir do not take us all for Children, that will preſently be frighted by big Words, and haughty Pretences, tho' ever ſo falſe and unreaſonable. Your additional Articles are perfectly New, and not Explications of the Old, and all your confident Pretences to the contrary will never diſprove it.

Reſt. May not we explain the Ancient Creeds, as the Councils of *Nice*, *Chalcedon*, and *Epheſus*, &c. *had done long before?*

---

* *Pag.* 33.

Vind. I

Vind. I will not take notice of your putting *Chalcedon* before *Epheſus*, inſtead of *Conſtantinople*; but ſhall content my ſelf to tell you, what I have already intimated, that tho' theſe Councils did indeed explain the Articles of former Creeds, by enquiring into the true meaning of them, and condemning their Oppoſers; yet this will do your Church no good, which has not explained the Ancient Creeds, but added many new Articles of her own, that have no Relation to them, nor ever were in any of them. This is our Accuſation; and we require ſomething more than a groundleſs Denial, in Anſwer to it. *

---

* *See this excellently well argued by the Learned Dr.* Hickes, *in the firſt Volume of his nervous Controverſial Letters Chap. X. pag.* 191, *and* 192. *You know* Vincentius Lirinenſis *compares the Ancient Creed, as to it's* Parts, *to the Limbs and Members of a Child's Body, which though they grow and increaſe to manly Stature, yet remain the ſame without Addition or Change. And if you can fairly ſhew, that your additional Definitions in* Pius IV*th's Creed, are only the growth and increaſe of the Limbs and Parts of the ancient Creed, then I will confeſs, that it is only increaſed by them, and differs no more from the ancient Creed, than a Man from a Boy or Child. You know he alſo compares the Articles of the old Faith to grains of Wheat caſt into the Ground, which in proceſs of time grow and increaſe, and get a new Form and outward Appearance, without any change of their Nature; and though they multiply, yet they multiply in the ſame kind of Grain, which are all wholeſome Wheat, and not Tares, or poiſonous Weeds. According to which Similitude, if you undertake to deduce your additional Doctrines and Definitions, from any of the old Principles or Articles of Faith, I muſt beg leave to put you in remembrance ſo to do it, as that the deduced Doctrines may appear to retain the Nature of the reſpective old Articles, from which you deduce them, and not be of another kind: If you can do this, you will do your Church the beſt Service that ever Man yet did it, much better than* Bellarmin, *or the Biſhop of* Meaux

Reſt. I am much offended at his next Anſwer, that *the Sacraments* are not a Part of *our Faith*, tho' *divinely* Inſtituted, and *divinely* Revealed.

Vind. He does not deny that they ought to be religiouſly received, and whatever is revealed concerning them to be ſtedfaſtly believed. But he looks upon them as Divine Inſtitutions, *Signs* and *Seals* of *our Faith*; and ſo reckons them amongſt the *Agenda*, rather than the *Credenda* of our Religion, as I noted before. And what great Inconvenience there is in this, that ſhould ſo highly diſpleaſe you, I do not ſee.

Reſt. Next he ſays, † *We have more Sects among us than you have among you*, and that his Church *is no more anſwerable for thoſe that break off from her, than we are for thoſe that break off from us.*

Vind. As to the former of theſe Charges, there needs only to read his Words, to make it appear juſt and reaſonable. *If a Church*, ſays his Gentleman, † *is anſwerable for all that break off from her, then you have all theſe Sects to reckon for, and us too, which is one more.* This is no leſs than Demonſtration. And the other is very like it. His *Popiſh* Lord has denied, that *a Church is anſwerable for*

---

did it; *and for your Performance you'll deſerve a Monument of everlaſting Honour, both from her, and ours. But if you cannot do this we muſt ſtill maintain, that* Pius's *Creed is not* profectus fidei, *but* permutatio, *not an increaſe, but a change of the old Faith, and new not only in the manner, but matter thereof, quite of another kind, and different and diſagreeing from the old Creed, and what was taught as neceſſary to Salvation in the ancient Chriſtian Church*, &c.

† *C. R. p.* 33.

* *Pag.* 34.

† *C. S. p.* 19.

thoſe

thoſe who break off from her, becauſe they are no longer of her. Therefore ſays his Gentleman very rightly, † *We are not anſwerable for the Sects which break off from our Church.* Here is a natural and undeniable Inference, from the Lord's Poſition; which you had a mind to find fault with, but could not; and therefore was forced to change the State of the Queſtion, by turning it into a comparative Aſſertion; but all to no purpoſe. For thus you miſrepreſent his Words. *He ſays, that his Church is no more anſwerable for thoſe that break off from her, than we are for thoſe that break off from us.* Whether this be charging him fairly, let any Man judge. But ſince you will have it ſo, I muſt take liberty to affirm, that you are much more anſwerable for thoſe who have broken off from you, than our Church is, for ſuch as have left her, becauſe ſhe is not guilty of thoſe groſs Corruptions, both in Doctrine and Practice, whereby you have ſhut up the Door, againſt ſuch as might otherwiſe have been deſirous of your Communion. Yet this Topick of our unhappy Diviſions is what your Miſſionaries oft inſiſt upon, and glory in, and by this means win over divers of our weaker and leſs judicious Brethren. But with how little Reaſon every one may ſee in an admirably learned and judicious Diſcourſe, written by the Reverend Dr. *Hickes*, intituled, *An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of* England; *in anſwer to her Adverſaries, who reproach her with the* Engliſh *Hereſies and Schiſms*; Printed for *Walter Kettleby* at the *Biſhop's-Head* in St. *Pauls Church-yard*; which has been twice Publiſhed, and the Adverſaries challenged to anſwer

† *C. R. p.* 26.

it;

it; but none of them have ever dared to attempt it.

Reſt. **Your Author begins his ſixth Section with a ſtout Argument: The* Greek Church, ſays he, *is* elder than *yours, and therefore your Church* broke off from her.

Vind. And what ſay you to this?

Reſt. I ſay, Another gallant conſequence.

Vind. And do you deſign that for an Anſwer?

Reſt. Not a full one; and therefore I add, *'tis not Age, or Priority of time, but of* Juriſdiction, *that gives the Supremacy.* And this, I ſay, *I have told you already, and am weary of repeating a thing ſo often.*

Vind. Whether weary of it, or not; you may well be aſhamed to have repeated this groundleſs Pretence of Supremacy ſo often, unleſs you could give better Proof of it, than any we have yet met with, or are like to have from you.

Reſt. I ask, *Is the Greek Church elder than St.* Peter, *who fixed his Seat at* Rome?

Vind. You may ask, if you pleaſe, whether it be elder than our bleſſed Saviour? or than all his Apoſtles, or whatever elſe you think fit. But the Queſtion with your Adverſary is not whether the *Greek* Church was elder than St. *Peter*; but whether Chriſtianity was preached, and a Church ſettled in *Greece*, before St. *Peter* came to *Rome?* that being enough to prove her an Elder Siſter againſt any thing you have ſaid to the contrary.

Reſt. † *Other Churches in* Great Britain *are elder*

---

* *C. R. p.* 35. † *Ibid.*

than

than Canterbury, *yet* Canterbury *has the Primacy over them all.*

Vind. That there was a Christian Church in this Island * before the coming of *Augustine*, and consequently before *Canterbury* was a Metropolitical See, or indeed any See at all, is not denied. But then it is to be remembred, that her Claim over the several Churches of this Province, proceeds only from a known indisputable *Primacy* that has been since given her. And could you give as good Evidence for your *Romish* Supremacy over all, as she can for her Primacy over this part of *England*, we would have no dispute with you upon this account; tho' so long as you retain and impose your known Corruptions, we necessarily must upon others.

Rest. We can tell the Place where, the Time when, the Manner how, and the Persons who first broached their Errors. This they can never do against us, and we defy them altogether to shew the least Innovation in any Point of our Doctrine, which you condemn as erroneous.

Vind. It is so usual with you to boast, and strut, and hector, and challenge, and defy, when you have least reason for it, that whenever I find you at this sport, I am tempted to suspect your Case is bad. And so it proves here. The Original and Progress of your Innovations, have been so oft and so fully made out, and your Churches Errors so irrefragably exposed, amongst others abroad, by † *Chemnitius*, and || *Peter du Moulin*, and as to divers of them so largely by Mr. *

---

* *Bed. Hist. Eccl. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *p.* 111. *Spelm. Conc. To.* 1. *p.* 104, &c. *Brompt. Chron. Reg. Northumbr. Col.* 780.

† *Exam. Con. Trid.* || *Nouvanté du Papisme.*

* *De Cultus Religiosi Objecto; de Auriculari Confessione; de cultibus Religiosis Latinorum: de Extremâ Unctione; & de Pœnis & satisfactionibus.*

Daillée,

Daillée, and at home by Mr. * *Perkins* formerly, and since by Bishop † *Stillingfleet* as to these Six Points, *The Authority of Tradition, the Canon of Scripture, the use of the Scripture in the Vulgar Tongue, the Merit of good Works, the number of Sacraments, Auricular Confession*; as to *Saint-Worship*, and *Extreme Unction*, by Dr. ‖ *Claget*; as to *Transubstantiation*, by * Bishop *Cosins*, and Dr. † *Tillotson*; as to the *Celibacy of the Clergy* by Mr. * *Wharton*; as to the *Latin Service*, *Image-Worship*, *Communion in one kind*, and *Tradition*, by Dr. † *Whitby*, to name no more at present, that you have no way of vindicating your selves, but by pretending to contemn your Opposers, whom you see you cannot answer. This you do in a particular manner to Dr. *Allix*, who you say *has exposed himself to the Laughter of all Learned Men, by an Attempt of this Nature*. And I expect you will do as much for these I have here named, or any others that have taken the same care to expose your Corruptions, and caution People against them. And for this necessary Reason, because you are not able to defend them. But believe me Sir, it is no Laughing Matter; as you will find at the last day. And if you think you can vindicate your selves, it is a piece of Justice you owe to your selves. And till you can do this, I am sure you are indispensably obliged to renounce your Er-

---

* *Demonstration of the Problem.*

† *The Council of* Trent *examined and disproved.*

‖ *Discourse concerning the Worship of the B. Virgin and the Saints. And concerning the Pretended Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*

* *Hist. Transubstantiationis.*

† *Discourse about Transubstantiation.*

* *Treatise of the Celibacy of the Clergy.*

† *Treatise in confutation of the Latin Service &c. Second instance of the Error of the Church of* Rome. *Demonstration that the Church of* Rome *and her Councils have erred; Treatise of Tradition, in 2 Parts.*

rors, and not think it will ſerve your turn, either before God, or Man, to deride thoſe who have been at the pains of ſhewing the right Way, and perſuading you to walk in it.

Reſt. * *One would think* your Author *never had heard any thing of the Infamous* Photius.

Vind. Pray have you heard of the more Infamous † *Phocas*, and his Flatterer *Boniface* III. and how by his undue Compliances with that Uſurper and Murderer, || he obtained the Title you are ſo highly concerned for? If you had, one would think you ſhould not be ſo very fond of it.

Reſt. There is nothing more notorious, than that the Greek Church owned the Supremacy of ours.

Vind. How do you prove this?

Reſt. I bring you three Arguments for it.

Vind. I am apt to think ſomething may be *more notorious*, than what has nothing better to ſupport it, than theſe Arguments. But pray let me hear them.

Reſt. I. *She allowed the Church of* Rome *to preſide in Councils made up of her Biſhops.*

Vind. If this prove a Supremacy, it will prove that *Hoſius* a *Spaniard* had the Supremacy over both *Greek* and *Latin* Church, at the time of the *Nicene* Council, and *Cyril* at the time of the *Epheſine*, for theſe Councils were made up of both. But this you know was not ſo.

Reſt. Theſe Biſhops moreover *call him their Head, and themſelves his Members, and teſtify all manner of*

---

* Ibid.

† Φωκᾶς οἰνοβαρὴς, ἀμαχιμὴς, καὶ πρὸς γυναῖκας ἐπτοημένος, βιαιρὸς καὶ θρασὺς ἐν τῇ φθείρειν ἀσυμπαθὴς καὶ ἀνιώδυνος ἐπὶ τρόπον, καὶ αἱρετικὸς. Cedren Hiſt. Compend. p. 404. χείρονα δὲ εὗρον πρὸς τὰ κακίαν τῶν καπικένταν ἐν τῇ πόλει. Id. p. 407. Ἀσελγέσατον κέντρον. *Theophilact.* Hiſt. l. 8. c. 10.

|| Plat. in vit. Bonifac. 3.

ſubje-

subjection to him. The Fathers at *Chalcedon*, thus addreſs themſelves to *Leo*; *Thou governedſt the Members as Head.*

Vind. The Words of the Council are, * Ὃν μὲν, ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ἡγεμόνευες, ἐν τοῖς δὲ σοῖς τάξιν ἐπέχουσι, *Whom thou governedſt, as the Head doth it's Members, by thoſe that ſupply thy place.* And they were ſpoken to him only as Preſident of that Council by his Legates, who had diſcharged this Office amongſt them to their great ſatisfaction. But it is too much to infer from hence an Univerſal Supremacy, for *Leo*; here being nothing ſaid with relation to the whole Church, but purely to the ordering and management of that ſingle Council. So that effectually to anſwer this Addreſs of the Council, there needs no more than barely to give the Reader it whole, and in it's own Language. Which you had taken care not to do.

Reſt. I gave you alſo the Words of the *Epheſine* Council, τὰ ἅγια μέλη τῇ ἁγίᾳ κεφαλῇ.

Vind. Theſe are the Words of *Philip* a Presbyter, the Popes Legate in that Council. But they want likewiſe to be more fully and clearly repreſented. Τὰ ἅγια μέλη ταῖς ἁγίαις ὑμῶν φωναῖς, τῇ ἁγίᾳ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ταῖς ἁγίαις ὑμῶν ἐκβοήσεσιν ἐνώσατε. *Being holy Members, ye have by your holy Voices, joyned your ſelves to your holy Head, and by your holy Exclamations.* Where it is to be noted, that this is only an Expreſſion of the Pope's Legate, who be ſure would not fail to do what in him lay, to magnify his Maſter's Character and Power. And yet he repreſents him as Head of the Council, after the ſame manner as St. *Peter* was Head of the Apoſtles; whom I have ſhewn to have had no Authority over them; and by conſequence neither can the Pope have over

* Conc. Chalced. Par. 3. cap. 2. p. 833.

those Bishops, who are not of his Patriarchate.

Rest. The *Constantinopolitan* Fathers say, *ye have called us together as your Members.*

Vind. It is true; the Fathers met at *Constantinople*, wrote *a respectful Letter to *Damasus* and those assembled with him at *Rome*, thanking them for commiserating their Sufferings, and treating them as Members of the same Body with themselves. But it is much harder to frame an Argument from hence for the Pope's Universal Supremacy, than to answer it when set forth to the best Advantage. There is no subjection at all owned; and if there had, it must have been not to *Damasus* alone, but since no distinction is made between him and them, to the other Bishops together with him. Which is more than you desire, or would assent to. And thus I have shewn that the Oriental Bishops do not so *call the Pope their Head, and themselves his Members*, as *to testify all*, or indeed any, *manner* of Subjection to him out of the Council.

Rest. II. *'Tis notorious that she,* [the *Greek* Church] *allowed the Pope's Jurisdiction over her Patriarchs, Bishops,* &c. *and that he deposed them, restored others,* &c.

Vind. As *notorious* perhaps as what you pretended before concerning their owning themselves his Subjects. But to your Proof.

Rest. Sozomen says it, and *Theodoret*, and *Socrates.*

Vind. Let us hear them in their Order. And begin if you please with *Sozomen.*

Rest. It is in the third Book of his Ecclesiastical History, the second Chapter.

Vind. I suppose you mean the Eighth and Tenth Chapters, where he treats of *Julius*'s concern for St. *Athanasius*, *Paul* of *Constantinople*, and two others,

---

* Theodorit. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 8. † *C. R.* p. 37.

who being unjuſtly deprived of their Biſhopricks for their adhering to the *Nicene* Faith, had fled to him for Refuge, and whom he therefore not only received to Communion, but looking upon himſelf concerned to have a particular regard to all Chriſtians, upon account of the eminent Station wherein he was ſet, *reſtored them*, as much as in him lay, *to their ſeveral Churches*; affirming, that it was *againſt Law*, that ſuch Proceedings *had been without informing him*, and that they were *void upon this account*. What Law it was that *Julius* refers to, our Hiſtorian does not acquaint us. Nor were his endeavours for the Reſtoration of theſe injured Biſhops ſo ſucceſsful, but that he was forced to make his Complaint to the Emperor *Conſtans*, and entreat the Aſſiſtance of his Power for making them effectual. Which was no very promiſing Sign of his ſupereminent Power in this reſpect, and that it was owned by the *Greek* Church.

Reſt. Theodoret ſpeaks alſo to the ſame effect, in the ſecond Book of his Hiſtory, Chap. iv.

Vind. Theodoret here affirms *Julius* upon *Athanaſius*'s Complaint, who was then at *Rome*, and ſo within his Juriſdiction, to have, *in purſuance of a Law*, or Canon, *of the Church*, ſummon'd him before him, and call'd his Accuſers alſo to come and make out their Charge againſt him. This Canon, *Valeſius*, a zealous Advocate for your pretended Supremacy, * takes nevertheleſs to be that which forbids Judgment to be given without hearing both ſides, the ſame that *Athanaſius* mentions in his ſecond Apology, p. 799, as founded upon thoſe Words of St. *Paul*, † *Act.*

---

* In loc.

† *Who ought to have been here before thee, and object if they had ought againſt me.*

24. 19, together with those of *Festus*, * Ch. 25. 16. Now when the deprived Bishops fled to *Julius* for help against their Adversaries, he might reasonably enough let the adverse Party know it, and desire to hear what they had against them, before he applied himself to the Emperor in their behalf, or tried any other way in order to their Restoration. But this will never prove, that he had of himself full Power to determine the Cause, and do them Right without any other Assistance. As you must needs see.

Rest. Hear farther what *Socrates* says in the Case, in his second Book, ch. v.

Vind. Pardon me, if I think you are again mistaken, because that Fifth Chapter has nothing in it, that will at all suit with your purpose. For which reason I suspect the Passage you aim at, to be here likewise in the Eighth Chapter, where I find these Words. Κανόνα Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κελεύοντα, μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὸ γνώμιμον τῆς ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης, τὰς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν, *that the Churches ought not to make Canons, without the consent of the* Roman *Bishop by reason of an Ecclesiastical Canon so ordering.* But here you may please to observe, that the Historian does not declare, in what place this Canon was made, when, or by whom, or where it is to be found. And so you cannot look for any Judgment to be made of it a present. But if you shall think fit to produce it at your leasure, you may then expect a farther Answer.

Rest. III. † *The many Appeals made to the Pope, by Patriarchs, Primates, Bishops, &c. is a farther Proof,*

---

* *It is not the manner of the Romans, to deliver any Man to dye, before that he which is accused, have the Accusers face to face, and have Licence to answer for himself, concerning the Crime laid against him.*

† *C. R.* I. 37.

of

of the Pope's Supremacy being owned in the Greek Church.

Vind. This you aſſert; but have not thought fit to acquaint us with one of theſe Appeals, or to ſhew us when they were made, and by whom. And ſo your unſupported Aſſertion is of no uſe to you. Eſpecially ſince from the places referred to p. 48, it will appear that they muſt have been uncanonical and unneceſſary.

Reſt. *Read St.* Auguſtin's *Epiſtle* 162, *and you will be convinced of your Author's Miſtake.*

Vind. I am not firſt to read that Epiſtle now; but it is not conceivable, what miſtake of our Author's I can diſcover by it. You cannot ſuppoſe it is to teach me, that the *numerous Churches* of *Aſia*, and the *Swedes*, *Danes*, &c. own the Pope's Supremacy, nor yet that they are all *condemned Hereticks*, as you aſſert. Nor can I imagine, why you inſiſt on this Epiſtle, unleſs, becauſe it is ſo long you promiſed your ſelf the Reader would take it upon truſt, rather than be at the pains of looking it over to confute you. St. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks indeed of *a Catholick Unity diffuſed over the whole World*, but does not ſay the whole World owned the Pope for their Head. And the *African* and *Carthaginian* Canons aſſure us for that Part of the World, that they did not, by their diſallowing of Appeals to him. Speaking alſo of the *Roman* Church, he ſays, *in which the Authority of the Apoſtolical Chair had always a ſingular ſway*; as no doubt it had, and ought to have. But he does not ſay all other Churches were ſubject to it. And as to the Title of *Apoſtolical See*, this, it is well known, is no more than has been given to thoſe of * *Antioch* and *Jeruſalem*, to name no more at preſent.

---

* Ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ. τ Συείας. Theod. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 9. Nor was *Antioch* called only an *Apoſto-*

And this very Father, a little after in this same Epistle, makes mention of * *Apostolical Churches*, in the Plural Number, and thereby undeniably testifies this Epithet, not to imply any Universal Supremacy; unless all these several Churches were invested in it, as well as that of *Rome*. And if you think from this Epistle to prove a Right in the Pope, to require Appeals from other Churches, you ought to know, here is no other Appeal spoken of but of the *Donatists*, whom I hope you will not propound as a proper Example, for the Imitation of all other Churches. Especially if it be farther considered, that this Appeal, tho' directed to *Rome*, was nevertheless not to the Pope, but the Emperor, which I doubt upon second thoughts you will not at all like. Insomuch that had you your self read over this Epistle, at least with any manner of care, I cannot think you would have apprehended it for your Interest, so much as once to put your Reader in mind of it.

Rest. † *I wonder your Author does not remember, what was decreed* in the Council of *Sardica*; which *allows Bishops to appeal to the Pope, in case of Grievance.*

Vind. It *Allows*, pray mark that; it permits such Application, but does not teach, or enjoyn it, as a necessary Duty; as it certainly would, had the Church of *Rome* then had such a supreme Authority and Jurisdiction, as you now pretend to. A

---

lical Church, but the Seat of St. *Peter* too. Θρόνον τ' Ἀντιοχείας μεγαλοπόλεως τ τῆς ἁγίας Πέτρου. Conc. *Chalced.* Act. 7. p. 364. τῆς ἀποστολικῆς θρόνου. Sozom. l. 1. c. 2. Exercet Apostolatus vester concessos à Divinitate Primatus. *Avit. Vienn.*

* In like manner as St. *Ambrose* says of Bishops in general *Episcopus personam habet Christi*, and again, *Vicarius Domini est.* In 1 Cor. c. 11.

† *Pag.* 37.

singular

ſingular Regard was always had to that See, not only as it was one of the Apoſtolical Sees, but as *Rome* was the Imperial City; as has been noted above. And no wonder therefore, if ſuch who thought themſelves grieved, were deſirous to have ſometimes the Opinion, of ſo famous a Prelate and his Suffragans, concerning their Caſe. But this is no Evidence, that they were neceſſarily bound to refer their Cauſe to his Deciſion, whether they deſired it, or not. It is firſt propoſed to the Council for their Approbation, * *Whether in their Opinion ſuch Appeals ſhould be allowed?* Which certainly would not have been done, if the Biſhops there aſſembled had known it to be a neceſſary Duty, and what was incumbent on them before. The Reference alſo was to be to Pope *Julius* by Name, without mentioning his Succeſſors, as if he only were to have this Honour paid him. Or if they too were to be concerned in their turns, ſtill it is not left to them to call the matter to their own Conſiſtory, but only to appoint ſome of the Neighbour-Biſhops to rehear the Cauſe, and give their Opinions of it when deſired; and this a ſecond time, if demanded. Which does not argue the Pope, to have then had any ſuch Supremacy, as is now contended for. And yet as it is, the Learned Mr. *Du Pin* declares, † of this Decree, that *it was never received nor obſerved in the* Eaſt. *In the* Weſt *the Biſhops of* Africa *oppoſed it, and it was long before it was obſerved in the other Countries of the* Weſt. Which is no ſmall Prejudice to any Claim, that might come to be founded upon it. And yet this is not all. For the Learned Biſhop *Beveridge* produces a *Scholium* upon the Fourth Ca-

---

* Εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῖν τὴν ἀγάπην.

† *Compendious Hiſtory of the Church*, Ch. IV. p. 130.

non,

non, which notes farther, that this Canon could not be designed, to settle the Doctrine of Appeals to *Rome*, for these four Reasons. 1. Because so, this Provincial Synod would contradict such as were Oecumenical, and particularly the fifth Canon of the great *Nicene* Council. 2. Because it does not allow all Bishops who are Deposed, to make use of this Remedy, but such only as are Deposed by their Neighbour-Bishops, without taking notice of their Metropolitan or Patriarch. And again, 3. Because this Synod, tho' you are pleased, for what Reason you know best, to call it a General one, consisted only of *Occidentalists*; and so could not oblige the *Greeks*, and the other Eastern Churches. 4. And lastly, Because ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ ἐδαμοῦ μέχει τῆ νῦν σωνήθεια τοιαύτη κεκράτηκεν, *this custom had no where obtained in the East to that very day.* And now I leave it to you, to make the best you can of this Council.

Rest. The Greeks * *believed the Pope to be Supreme, and so did* then *all Faithful* Christians *in the World, for the Reasons expressed in an Imperial Law, published in those Primitive times,* viz. *That* † *the Supremacy of the See Apostolick has been established, both by the Merit of St.* Peter, *who is the Prince of the Episcopal Society, by the Dignity of the City, and by the sacred Authority of a Synod.*

Vind. What Precedence the Pope may pretend to, as Successor to St. *Peter*, and as given him by Canon, has been already noted; as also that a particular Respect was paid him, because of his being Bishop of the Imperial City. And if *Valentinian* and *Theodosius* intended any more here, they must be said out of their great Reverence to the Pope, to have carried the matter farther than they could

---

* *C.R. p.* 38. † Theodos. Novell. Tit. 24.

justify.

juſtify. But by what follows a little after, they ſeem only to aim at the rectifying a Diſorder committed in the Pope's own Patriarchate, and ſo which fell properly under his Cognizance and Correction. *Hilary* who called himſelf a Biſhop of *France*, had been chargeable with undue Ordinations of Biſhops, diſplacing ſome without a competent Authority, and ordaining others into their Places, without conſulting the Biſhop of the Church of *Rome*, and at laſt defending what he had done, by armed Force. And *the Peace of the Churches* could not *be preſerved*, if ſuch Irregularities were ſuffered to paſs without Animadverſion. And this ſeems to be the Deſign of this Law. But if more were intended by it, and it were really to be of Univerſal Obligation, nevertheleſs I cannot be perſuaded, that a Law of theſe Emperors ſhould in an Eccleſiaſtical Affair, over-rule the Canons of General Councils, which the Pope himſelf is obliged in his Station to obſerve, as well as other Biſhops. Neither do we know at this diſtance of time, by what unfair means it might have been obtained, for the gratifying of the Pope, rather than the Benefit of the Church. The ſumm is, that ſince I have diſproved the Pope's Pretended Right to an Univerſal Supremacy over the whole Church of Chriſt, were the Paſſages you cite for it, ever ſo plain on your ſide, all you could aim at from hence, were only to ſhew the Ancient Writers to have differed from one another about it; which were but a poor way of defending it, and will never prove you had juſt reaſon to undertake the Defence of it. Wherefore I leave this high, but unreaſonable Claim of your Church, I have had ſo long under conſideration; and proceed to another as vain, I mean that of her pretended Infallibility.

Reſt.

Reſt. * *Your Author ſays, this is no where, nor can be among Men.*

Vind. And all you offer in diſproof of this, is only that Men may have infallible Evidence for ſome particular Truths and Facts; who yet may be notoriouſly fallible in the main; or that it is in the Power of Almighty God to preſerve Men from Error, which is no Anſwer at all to our Author, unleſs you could prove that God actually does this; which you have not done, nor ever can. And ſo his Aſſertion ſtands good againſt you.

Reſt. † *Not one of his Quotations proves that* the Jewiſh Church *erred in her Doctrine.*

Vind. Whether theſe Quotations prove it, or not, it is paſt doubt, that they very groſly erred, || when they taught, as well as practiſed Idolatry, * when their *Prophets propheſied falſly*, and the *People loved to have it ſo*; † when they *taught for divine Doctrines the* bare *Traditions of Men*; but moſt groſly of all || when they denied our bleſſed Lord to be *the Son of God*, and their long expected *Meſſias*, and perſecuted him to the Death, for profeſſing himſelf to be ſo. I hope you will not ſay, they were ſtill infallible. But now as to the places mentioned, *Mal.* 2. 8. *Ye are departed out of the way*, ſaith the Prophet.

Reſt. This was matter of Practice, as I told you, and ſo not inconſiſtent with Infallibility.

Vind. I am apt to think God will never make a Succeſſion of wicked Men Infallible. And yet if he will not, your pretended Infallibility has for divers Ages been but in a bad Con-

---

* *C. R. p.* 55. † Ibid.

|| Judg. 2. 11, 12, 13. & 3. 6. Jer. 44. 15. &c. *and multitudes of other places.*

* Jer. 5. 31. † St. Matth. 15. 9.

|| St. Jo. 10. 33. & 19. 7.

dition.

dition. But as to what follows, *ye have caused many to stumble at the Law.*

Rest. Yes by their bad Example.

Vind. And why not as well, by their false Doctrines? But pray mark the next words. *Ye have corrupted the Covenant of Levi, saith the Lord,* as much as to say they had vitiated, mis-interpreted, and put strange glosses upon it; which must needs have been by false and erroneous Doctrines. And I am sure this is erring in Doctrine, whether you will allow it to be called so or not.

Rest. The Passage of Isaiah is not said of the Jews *as a* Church, *but as a* Nation, *Is.* 1. 5, *&c.*

Vind. Did not the *Church* and *Nation* both consist of the same Persons?

Rest. Yes.

Vind. Then if the whole *Nation* erred, I am afraid the Church at that time could not possibly be *Infallible.* But how do you prove the Jews were not here spoken of as a *Church?*

Rest. The following words manifestly shew it.

Vind. That is easier said than proved.

Rest. Suppose it be said of the Jews *as a* Church, *it is in relation to her* Manners, *and not her* Faith.

Vind. Verse 3, they are complained of for their Ignorance, and Inconsideration; *Israel doth not know, my People doth not consider.* And was this only in relation to their Manners? * Sure you will not say so. But to come to the Words themselves. *From the sole of the Foot even unto the Head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores.* If no soundness at all in them,

---

* Potest hic locus & de Deo Patre intelligi, sed magis refertur ad filium, quod non cognoverit eum, neque susceperit Populus Israel: cujus diem Abraham vidit, & lætatus est; & in cujus adventu omnium prophetarum vota pendebant. *B. Hieron.* in loc.

then

then ſure neither in Church, nor State, nor Manners, nor Doctrine.

Reſt. The Paſſage in Jeremiah has the ſame meaning, *Jerem.* 12. 8, 9.

Vind. If ſo, the ſame Anſwer might ſerve. But I refer it to your ſelf. Pray conſider in what ſenſe the Prophet here calls them, more than once God's *Heritage*, whether they were principally ſo, as a Church or as a State; and then ſay this Place is groſly miſapplied, if you can.

Reſt. 'Tis moſt untrue, that the Promiſes he mentions, If. 59. 21, *were made to the* Jewiſh *Church, or belong literally to her.*

Vind. That this Promiſe was to extend to the Times of the *Meſſiah*, the beſt Commentators allow; but I much queſtion whether you will find any amongſt them, who will ſay it was not made primarily to the *Jews*. And your ſaying *'tis moſt untrue*, is no Argument with me, that it is not *moſt True.*

Reſt. * *He returns again to his old Fallacy of confounding the particular Church of* Rome, *with the* Catholick Church *in Communion with the Biſhop of* Rome.

Vind. No Sir, I dare anſwer for him, that this is no *Fallacy* of his, but that by the Church of *Rome*, he means all in Communion with the *Roman* Church, and I do not queſtion but you well enough know that to be his meaning. But then you are not to imagine that he will, or can any way agree with you, that that Part of Chriſtendom is the truly *Catholick Church*. And if I ſhould charge you as guilty of a *Fallacy*, in groundleſly ſuppoſing it to be ſo, and then arguing upon ſuch your falſe Suppoſition, it would be impoſſible for you to clear your ſelf. It is not the Supremacy

---

* *C. R. p.* 56.

of

of your Bishop, nor the extent of his Dominion, and the Number of his Subjects, nor your arrogating to your selves the Name of the only Catholicks, nor any such outward Mark or Note, whereby your Title to this Claim can be made good. The only proper and sure way whereby to judge of you aright, is that our blessed Saviour prescribes for the Discovery of false Prophets. * *By their Fruits ye shall know them.* Whilst your Corruptions both in Faith and Worship are so many and so foul, it is to no purpose to flatter your selves, with the Name of Catholicks. You may assume to your selves, as glorious Titles as you please; but it is only by your faithful adherence to the Directions of the Gospel, as understood in the Primitive times, and all the best and purest Ages of our Religion, that you can ever truly entitle your selves to them. And then, but not till then, you may have *all Pretences to all the Promises made to the Church in general*, and to every Pure and Orthodox Church in particular.

Rest. He grants † *the Promises of God can never fail, if the Condition imply'd be observed.*

Vind. Here he adds something, you did not think it for your purpose to take notice of, namely, that ‖ *We may mistake God's Promises, and not understand them aright.* By which means a Church or a Nation, may think themselves to have a Right to them, when they really have not. Which is the Case of your Church, in respect to both the Supremacy and Infallibility, which she would fain persuade her self and others, were promised to her; when upon Inquiry no such Promise can any where be found.

---

* St. Matth. 7. 20. † *C. R. p.* 57.
‖ *C. S. p.* 28.

Rest. His

Reſt. His Aſſertion that there is ſtill a Condition implied in God's Promiſes is falſe.

Vind. This is ſo apparent a Falſity in you, that I can ſcarce think it worth confuting. However, ſince you urge it with ſuch aſſurance, pray let us have your Proof of it.

Reſt. The Promiſe of the Meſſiah, *and ſeveral other are Unconditional.*

Vind. This if true, would imply, that ſeveral others are Conditional; nor do you ſo much as pretend the contrary. But I know not how you will ever be able to prove it true. Even the Promiſe of the *Meſſiah*, ſuppoſed there would be great need of his Mediation, inaſmuch as Mankind could not hope to be ſaved without him. And ſince you do not particularly inſtance in any other, I have good Reaſon to conclude, you knew of none to inſtance in.

Reſt. The Paſſages he quotes, are nothing to his purpoſe.

Vind. So you ſay. But I obſerve of three that he has quoted, you nibble only at one of them, without the leaſt Exception to the other two. And in relation to that one all you object is, that *the Word Church is moſt unfairly foiſted in by the Author.* But give me leave to ſay this is *moſt unfairly* objected by you. For you know very well he does not pretend it to be in the Text, and to let every one ſee he does not, he has put it in a diſtinct Character, he has moreover marked it after the manner of a *Parentheſis*, that the Reader may know it to be his own Addition, intended only to ſhew, that that Promiſe or Threat'ning may in Equity belong as naturally to a Church, as the Letter of it does to a Nation. And there appears no Rea-

---

* *C. S. pag.* 28.

ſon,

ſon, why the Promiſes made to a Church muſt be more unconditional, than thoſe made to a State or Nation.

Reſt. * *Your Author quotes a Paſſage out of the* Romans, *againſt the* Church *of the* Gentiles, *but it makes nothing againſt us.*

Vind. You own here that *a Particular Church may err from the Faith*, and by Parity of Reaſon, a number of particular Churches, as many for inſtance as are now of your Communion may ſo err. And if ſo, where is the Certainty of your Infallibility? If inſtead of *Sweden, Denmark, Greece, &c.* be put the Church of *Rome*, and thoſe others in Communion with her, *Germany, France, Spain, &c.* theſe are *lamentable Proofs, that if a People do not continue in the goodneſs of God, and live up to the holy Religion they profeſs, God forſakes them, delivers them over to their own Deluſions, and takes from 'em his Kingdom, and gives it to Nations bringing forth its Fruits.* And this in my Opinion is too much againſt you to be deſpiſed.

Reſt. † *If nothing can be Infallible, but what is impeccable,* as your Author ſpeaks, *then no Man knows that Two and Two make Four, that a Part is leſs than the whole,* &c.

Vind. This is only repeating what you had ſaid a little before, in another dreſs. And the ſame Anſwer will ſerve here, as formerly, that to make a Man certain of ſome particular things, does not neceſſarily imply an Infallibility in him in others. But you put no difference between Knowledge, or Certainty, and Infallibility. As if a Man could not be ſure of a ſenſible Object, a matter of Fact, or a Mathematical Propoſition, without being infallibly aſſured of Tranſubſtantiation, and the other

---

* Pag. 58. † Pag. 61.

new Articles of the *Trent* Creed. Which is so irrational and absurd, that nothing can be more.

Rest. What Catholick *ever said that the* Apostles *were, or the* Church *is Infallible in every thing? What we say is, that the Apostles were, and the Church is infallible in delivering to us the revealed Doctrines of Christ; but in other things we own the Church may be, and has been mistaken.*

Vind. As to what you say here concerning the Apostles, I shall have no Dispute with you. My Exceptions to this Passage are only these. First that you proceed here upon your constant Fallacy of applying all Promises made to the Universal Church, to your own particular Roman Church. By which I have told you before, and for fear of being misapprehended, I now tell you again, I mean not the *Roman* Diocese, but those in Communion with it, in whatsoever Nation. To these you groundlesly apply whatsoever Promises are made to the Catholick Church. And by this means fall into many and gross Errors. And then that you confidently persist in your Claim of Infallibility, when your Errors and Corruptions are such, that nothing can be a more effectual Confutation of it. As has been abundantly made out from time to time, and more especially in the late King *James*'s Reign, when you had all the Liberty and Encouragement you could desire, to vindicate your selves, if you had known how. Tho' now it seems those Confutations are all vanished, and you can see none of them. Besides, our Author tells you farther, that the Church is represented in Scripture under such different Characters * as *are not to be reconciled but* by understanding them *of different* States *of the Church, and at different times.* And

* *C. S. p.* 31.

a little

a little after he adds, "But when we distinguish "not, and would apply to the most *Corrupt* State, "what is said of the most *Glorious*, we must needs "fall into many Errors and Mistakes. This is the "difficulty under which the Church of *Rome* now "labours, She first making her self the *Catholick* "*Church*: And then applying to her self, in this "her *corrupt* State, whatever is said of the Church "even in her *Perfect*, *Glorious*, and *Triumphant* "State; creates her infinite Trouble, and endless "Distinctions, to reconcile these; which is as "impossible to be done, as to make the State of "the *Church* in *Heaven* and upon the *Earth* to be "the same: And while the Corruptions in the "Church of *Rome* are confessed and lamented by "the most Learned, and most Pious in her own "Communion. In a word, I see not how you will be able to answer that Learned and Ingenious Knight Sir *Edwin Sandys*, who urges, * that *we must take it upon your own words to be true*, that you and your Church cannot possibly err. *For as for your conjectural Evidence out of Scripture, there seems*, as he proceeds, *to be as much, or more, for the King of* Spain's *not erring, as there is for the Pope's; it being said by the wisest, that the heart of the King is in the hands of God; a divine Sentence is in his Lips, and his Mouth shall not transgress in judgment.*

Rest. Have you done with this Article?

Vind. With our Author I have, but not with the Article it self. For 1. It is a strange thing to me, that you should value your selves upon a presumed Infallibility, which yet you know not where to find, not being agreed amongst your selves where to place it, whether in the whole Church, in the Pope alone, or with his Cardinals, in a Council alone,

* Europ. Spec. p. 203.

or in a Pope or Council together. Againſt each of which Pretences there lie ſuch invincible Objections as quite overthrow it. As might eaſily be ſhewn, but that I am deſirous not to enlarge upon this Subject, and the rather becauſe they are ſo well known as not to need it. And it is a rare Infallibility which you cannot infallibly tell where to find, when you have occaſion for it. 2. And it is as precarious and groundleſs as it is difficult to find out, there being no Foundation for it in Scripture, or Primitive Antiquity, neither of which that I know of ever taught the univerſal Church to be Infallible in all Matters of Revelation, much leſs thoſe only of the *Roman* Communion. 3. After all your Preſumptions of this nature, you ought to remember, that the *Jewiſh* Church had as fair Pretences to an Infallibility, as you can have, and yet theſe did not preſerve them from procuring the Death of the Son of God, and * many other grievous Errors; yet it cannot be denied, but they had as full a Charter for Infallibility, as any your Church could ever pretend to. See *Deut.* 17. 10, 11. *And thou ſhalt do according to the ſentence, which they of that place (which the Lord ſhall chuſe) ſhall ſhew thee, and thou ſhalt obſerve to do according to all that they inform thee. According to the ſentence of the law which they ſhall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they ſhall tell thee, thou ſhalt do: thou ſhalt not decline from the ſentence which they ſhall ſhew thee, to the right hand, nor to the left.* And of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* ſays our Saviour, St. *Matth.* 23.2,3. *They ſit in Moſes ſeat: All therefore whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and do.* And ſeeing this did not preſerve them from erring

* St. Matth. 15. 6. and 23. 27. and 26. 65, 66. and 27. 63. and Act. 5. 28. 29.

very

very grievouſly, it is impoſſible your Church, which has no ſuch Declaration or Injunction concerning it, ſhould ever be able to prove it ſelf more infallible than them. 4. Were this Infallibility as eaſy to be found, as well grounded, and as certainly to be depended on, as you would have us think ſtill it would be of no uſe to the generality of Mankind, unleſs a farther Miracle were wrought for its conveyance. For ſuppoſe now a Man comes to me for Inſtruction of his Ignorance, or Reſolution of his Doubts, or Conviction of his Errors, and I tell him he muſt ask of thoſe who are beſt able to teach him, if he be able muſt read and ſtudy good Books, and eſpecially the Holy Scriptures, which were given us by Almighty God for the Rule of our Faith and Manners, muſt pray to God for Direction, and muſt be very ſincere and impartial in all his ſearches after Truth, and give him what farther Advice I think proper. No ſay you; he need not give himſelf all this trouble, for I have an eaſier and ſhorter way for him, let him but come over to us, and give up his Judgment to our Infallible Church, to do what ſhe bids him, and believe whatever ſhe teaches him, and his Buſineſs is done. Very well ſays the poor well-meaning Diſciple, glad of ſo convenient a Paſſage to Heaven, and deſirous to be fully inſtructed concerning it; But pray Sir, how ſhall I know your Church is Infallible? You cannot queſtion ſay you the performance of our Saviour's Promiſe, that *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* I do not he replies, I cannot queſtion our bleſſed Saviour's Veracity; but how ſhall I infallibly know, either that this Promiſe implies an Infallibility, or that it is made to your Church more than others? Both which Suppoſitions I find are not only queſtion'd, but abſolutely denied by great numbers of both learned and good Men. Oh! ſay

you again, we shall easily satisfy these Inquiries. I doubt says he, not so easily; for I never met with any one yet that could. Yet if this were done, how could I be infallibly sure in whom this Infallibility were seated, considering the many Contests that are among your selves about it, some making * the Pope Infallible, at least † in Conjunction with his Cardinals, some || the Church Diffusive, some only * a Council, and others only † a Council confirmed by the Pope? And yet again, if this difficulty were got over, what were I the better? The Sense of the Church Diffusive can never be known, having never been declared by them hitherto, nor ever like to be so for the Future. If in a Council confirmed by the Pope, how shall I infallibly know that it is thus confirmed, who it may be cannot read the Acts and Canons of the Council, not understanding the Language in which they are written? If in a present living Council, that can speak for themselves and tell their meaning; where is your Infallibility when there is no Council sitting, as there has not been for a long time? And yet if there were, how could I and all People, go to them for their Direction, or how were it possible for them to give it? I know no way but by Writing, and why may I not as well understand the Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, as any Writing

---

* Stella in S. Luc. c. 22. 31.

† Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 3. Coster. Enchirid. c. 3. p. 136, 137.

|| Alphons. de Castro adv. hæres. l. 1. c. 4. Tostat. in S. Mat. quæst. 13. Papist misrepresented and Repr. ch. 17. p. 41. Bish. Bilson's true Difference, *&c.* p. 293. *The incomparable* Author of *Sure footing*, *&c.* p. 101, and 115.

* Staplet. Princip. Fidei demonstrat. l. 5. c. 7. Eck. Enchirid. de Conciliis p. 18. Council of *Trent*. l. 2. p. 125, 142.

† Melch. Can. loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 4.

of

of theirs. No doubt the Holy Ghoſt could enable the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, or whomſoever he pleaſed, to expreſs their meaning as fully and intelligibly as theſe can poſſibly do. Or if the Pope is to be this Infallible Guide, as the *Jeſuits* and others would have him, whether alone, or togegether with his Cardinals, it is impoſſible the whole World can flock to him for his Inſtruction, nor can I in particular, who live ſo many Hundreds of Miles from him, and it may be have neither Money, Health, nor Leaſure for ſo tedious, tireſom, and expenſive a Journey. Here Sir ſays the Confeſſor you are over-nice, your Expectations cannot be anſwered in this manner, nor need they. It is enough, that we who know the infallible Doctrine of the Church take care to explain it to you; which we are ſure to do very faithfully. Is this all you make ſuch a noiſe about, ſays the *Catechumen*, then it is time for me to look to my ſelf. I ſee after all your Boaſt of an Infallible Church, I am to depend alone upon the Voice of my Prieſt. And if he be not both Faithful and Infallible, I am in a ready way to be deceived to my own Deſtruction.

Reſt. * Such an one muſt be content to be inſtructed by his Prieſt.

Vind. But how ſhall he be able to ſatisfy himſelf, how ſhall he infallibly know, that his Prieſt inſtructs him right? This he can never be ſure of, unleſs his Prieſt were as Infallible as his Church; which I am ſure is more than the Prieſt himſelf will pretend to, or you for him. And now Sir

* Si ruſticus circa articulos credat ſuo Epiſcopo, proponenti aliquod dogma hæreticum, meretur in credendo, licet ſit error, quia tenetur credere, donec ei conſtet eſſe contra Eccleſiam *Tolet.* Inſtruct. Sacerd. l. 4. c. 3. n. 7. Ita & *Gabr. Biel.* l. 3. D. 25. Art. 3. Dub. 1.

what is become of your darling Infallibility? The pretence of it may ſerve to delude ſuch who do not underſtand it, and perhaps to get them over to your Communion, but it will ſtand them in no real ſtead, when you have got them. But I beg pardon for this Digreſſion, and return to our Author, who next charges you with falſe Miracles.

VII. *Reſt.* * *I own ſome wicked Members, of the* Church *of* Rome *have forged* falſe Miracles, which have been notoriouſly detected.

Vind. It is well you will own ſo much. Tho' it is no more than *Melchior Canus* had owned before you; adding moreover, that theſe their Feats have been tranſmitted to Poſterity by grave and ſerious Writers.

Reſt. But who detected them?

Vind. Your ſelves undoubtedly had the beſt opportunities of doing it if you would; but how well you have done it, I will not ſay. But let me ask you, did any of you ever go about doing it, till compelled to it by thoſe of the Reformation, exclaiming againſt you for their groſs Abuſes in this kind? Let me ask again, how many counterfeit Miracles are ſtill pretended to be wrought on ſome of your ſolemn Feſtivals, and even by your Prieſts themſelves, in the publick Church, and in the Face of numerous Congregations? As is too well known to thoſe who had had occaſion to travel into *Italy*, and ſome other Parts, where your Religion is profeſſed. After which it is very ſurprizing to hear you offering to

---

* *C. R.* p. 62.

† Negare non poſſumus viros, aliquando graviſſimos in divorum præſertim prodigiis deſcribendis, ſparſos rumores & excepiſſe, & ſcriptis etiam ad poſteros retuliſſe. *Loc. Theol.* l. 11. c. 6.

com-

compare such as deny these, to the *Jews* who *denied those of Jesus Christ*. I have often been heartily grieved, at this method of proceeding, amongst those of your Party; and am sorry to see that you will have your Share in it, that you care not what Mischief you do to Christianity in general, so you can but hope thereby, in any measure to cover your own Corruptions. This is not so sincere as were to be wished; but it is so common, that it must needs prejudice such as have occasion to observe it, against you, and so must disserve, instead of promoting your Religion.

VIII. *Rest.* * *Can your Author prove that the Church of* Rome *admits of any false Miracles?*

Vind. That she has done it formerly, and for a long time together, your Legendary Histories, and especially the *Historia Lombardica*, are abundant Evidence. And no longer since than in the last Age, how were the *Virgins* of † *Hall* and *Sichem* celebrated; and their Miracles applauded, and admired, as if they had been true? *Lipsius* has given us a particular account of them, and written with an air of seriousness, and plain dealing. And yet Mr. *Sheldon* who had been upon the spot, and made enquiry after them, assures us, || *tho' in his often travels in those Countries, he was very inquisitive, yet could he never meet with one Man or Woman, who could affirm himself to have been an* Eye-witness *of any one Miracle done either at* Sichem, *or at* Hall. And yet his Book bears date, at most not above Twelve Years after *Lipsius*'s. And his Inquiries might be much sooner. Nevertheless less I know not whether you will allow these, to pass amongst those *false Miracles, that have been de-*

---

* Pag. 63. † Virg. Hallens. & Aspricoll.

|| *Survey of the Miracles of the Church of* Rome *ch.* 3. *p.* 46.

tected;

tected; tho' I believe you will not pretend, that any Miracles are now wrought at either of those places, or have been since *Lipsius*'s time, and yet one would think the Images should have continued to have the same Virtue as before. But besides these, the Story of the *Lady's Chappel* at *Loretto*, must by no means be doubted of, that it was brought by Angels from *Nazareth* at several times, till they left it where it now is. And yet the bare Narrative of it, as we have it in * *Misson*, and others, is enough to give any one a surfeit of it. Now you will not pretend the Forgeries relating to this to have been *detected by the Church of* Rome, tho' they are so open and glaring, that others easily see through the whole Contrivance. But it is too profitable to be parted with, and therefore it is not worth while to insist any longer upon it. Yet if any desire to be fully informed of the Translation of this House from *Nazareth*, and the Evidence they have for it, and the many Miracles said to be wrought where it now stands, he may have his fill of them, in Bishop *Stillingfleet*'s second Discourse in *Vindication of his Protestant Grounds of Faith*. Ch. 3. p. 434, *&c.* together with divers other like Miracles, said to have been wrought in other Places, and by others of their Saints, St. *Francis*, St. *Dominick*, the *British* and *Irish* Saints, and others. Besides whom it were easy to refer to divers other Authors, who treat plentifully of this Subject, but that I think it needless.

Rest. VIII. † *Your Author laughs on still, and asks*, is it the Head or the Body of the same Saint, that is shewn in different Churches? And *I answer seriously*, no. *Two Cities in* France, Amiens *and St.*

---

* Lett. 20. Nouv. Voy. To. 1. p. 302, *&c.*

† *C. R.* p. 64.

Jean

Jean D'Angeli, *both pretend they have St.* John Baptiſt's *Head, but the Truth is they have Heads of Saints call'd* John; *ſo they are not miſtaken in the thing; but they give them the ſame Name.*

Vind. Is this the beſt defence you can make for them? Here are two Heads, both ſaid to belong to the ſame Saint, though both we are ſure he could not have. And his Worſhippers may be deceived, and moſt probably are in both Places; but in one of them we are ſure they are? Only you think to bring them off, by pleading they are both the Heads of Saints call'd *John.* Admit this, they are not both his Head whoſe Name they bear; and ſo the Worſhippers of one of them, muſt neceſſarily be guilty of Idolatry, in worſhipping that for St. *John Baptiſt*'s Head, which is not. But you ſay, *theſe are both Heads of Saints call'd* John. But how know you this? You have no more proof of their being the Heads of two *John*'s, than of one and the ſame *John.* Again, ſuppoſing they were the Heads of two *John*'s, how ſhould I know theſe were both Saints, and ſo in your Opinion to be Worſhipped. Here may be a miſchievous Miſtake, for ought appears to the contrary, like that of the ſuppoſed † Saints in the Catacumbs, who in reality were no Saints at all, ſome of them probably no Chriſtians.

Reſt. I ſaid before, this is no matter of Faith, and every one has free Liberty to think of it what he pleaſes.

Vind. But it is matter of Worſhip; and I would be glad to hear how you will be able to bring off thoſe, who pay their Devotions to both theſe Heads, when they know not which is the true Head of him they do deſign to Worſhip, but rather have reaſon to ſuſpect that neither is.

---

† P. *Mabillion* ſur le culte des Saints inconnus.

Reſt.

Reſt. We know there may be Abuſes amongſt us.

Vind. And we know * there are, and that your Church is pleaſed upon ſome occaſions to condemn them; yet ſhe does not † *uſe all means poſſible* to reform them, but too frequently, perfectly connives at, and perhaps encourages them.

Reſt. As to the Book your Author refers to, intituled, the Devotions of the Church of *Rome, it's an infamous* Collection *of ſcandalous Lies, and monſtrous Miſrepreſentations, compiled by the Ignorance and Malice of ſome Man void of Honour and Conſcience.*

Vind. Here you are in a fit of Rage, which vents it ſelf ſo indecently, and with ſuch exceſs of Fury and ill Language, as was not to have been expected, either from a Scholar or a Gentleman. The Author of the *Devotions of the Church, of* Rome was known to be a Man of very good Learning, and well verſed in the Writings of your Party, and the Devotions of your Church, perhaps much better than your ſelf; but you think you may make free with him, becauſe he is Dead, and ſo not in a condition to vindicate himſelf. But his great fault was this, that he has charged your Church highly, and made out his Charge, which becauſe you cannot confute, you therefore fall out with him, and treat his Memory in this vile abuſive Manner: Which ſhews he has touched you to the Quick, ſo as to put you out of all Patience. But it cannot be helped, the Evidence is clear, and you cannot hope to get rid of it, and therefore endeavour to prejudice your Readers againſt it, by giving the Author hard Names. But enough of this; and too much for you to anſwer.

---

* Id. p. 57. 59.

† Reponſe à une Lettre de Dom. Jean Mabillon p. 4, *&c.*

Reſt.

Reſt. * *What your Author ſays,* that our common People put the Legends upon the Level with the Holy Scriptures, as having the ſame Foundation, *is* another *notorious Calumny.*

Vind. What Reaſon have you for this Accuſation?

IX. *Reſt. Our Church propoſes to her* common People *the* Scriptures *as divinely revealed, and incapable of Error, ſhe propoſes the* Legends, *as human Hiſtory, capable of Corruptions and Miſtakes.*

Vind. You charge our Author with ſaying *your common People put the* Legends upon the *Level with the Holy Scriptures.* And ſee what an Anſwer you return to this? You challenge him to ſhew any of them that do ſo; and if he ſhould name any, I much queſtion whether that would ſilence you, though he knew them ever ſo well. You appeal to your Friend as to his Knowledge of them; but do not ſtay for his Anſwer; and ſo we are never the better for this Inquiry. But now, ſuppoſe your Church does teach a diſtinction betwixt the Credit due to Legends and the Holy Scriptures, yet ſince they are Recorded by Men of Note and Character amongſt you, as † *Melchior Canus* owns; are plentifully to be met with in your Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians; and are inſerted into ſeveral of your Divine Offices, your *Breviaries, Hours, proper Offices of Saints,* and ſome of your old *Miſſals* too, as might eaſily be ſhewn; too great occaſion is hereby given to the ordinary People to have an over-high Opinion of them. And whatſoever diſtinction your Church makes betwixt theſe and Scripture, this is no better Argument of the common People's underſtanding it, than your Catechiſm's ‖ teaching that Pictures and Images are not to be

* C. R. p. 65. † Loc. Theol. l. 11. c. 6.
‖ Par. 2. cap. 2. n. 18.

Prayed

Prayed to, is of the common People's not Praying to them; which I am very well assured they do, from such who have been Ear and Eye-witnesses of it.

Rest. As to what your Author adds; we give no handle to *Atheists* or *Deists*, to render Scripture fabulous; *but he and his* Conferers *are guilty of this Crime.*

Vind. And to support this your Charge against him, you take refuge amongst the Free-thinkers, and condemn, the learned Author of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, whose Book, I dare undertake to affirm, you can no more answer than you can Dr. *Barrow* of the *Supremacy*, or *the Devotions of the Church of Rome*, at which you are so outragiously Angry.

X. *Rest.* † He charges us with arguing in a *Circle*, in proving the Scriptures by the Church, and the Church by the Scriptures.

Vind. Whether this Charge does lie properly against your Church, I shall not stand at present to enquire. But as you have managed the Matter, pray give me leave to ask, how do you get out of this *Circle*?

Rest. I say, *a Circle is when one thing is proved by another, and so back again, to a Man who admits neither.*

Vind. Now to apply this to a Heathen, or if you please to one of your Friends the *Free-thinkers*; these it is plain *admit neither*, and how will your way of arguing with them ever help you out of this Circle?

Rest. Pray tell us, *what proof had we of the Church, before there were any Scripture Extant?*

Vind. The Sense and Experience of those, who knew and conversed with our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, and other Disciples, who heard their

† C. R. p. 67.

Doctrine,

Doctrine, and saw the numerous Miracles whereby it was confirmed.

Rest. Cannot the same Proof be employ'd now as well as then, to shew the true Church of Jesus Christ ?

Vind. Is this the best way to rid your self of your *Circle?* If so, I doubt you are in a way to tarry long enough in it; and particularly upon two Accounts. Because you cannot raise those to Life who could prove that Primitive Original Church: And because if they were now living, they would find your Church to be so sadly degenerated from the Simplicity and Purity of the Gospel, that they would all unanimously testify against you, as not the *true Church of Jesus Christ.*

Rest. We never denied that all bottoms upon our own Reason.

Vind. How do you reconcile this to your teaching and recommending an * *Implicite Faith.* These two cannot consist together. But you take a singular liberty to contradict the Writers of your own Church, when you conceive it for your Interest.

Rest. † *We think it inconsistent with the goodness of God, not to give us an infallible Guide to lead us in the right Way.*

Vind. You will be chusing for your selves, and telling Almighty God what were proper for him to have done, as your Champion *Bellarmin* did before you. Who if my Memory does not grosly fail me, argues somewhere after the same manner that you do, in behalf of the *Roman* Infallibility;

---

* Si rusticus circa articulos credat suo Episcopo proponenti aliquod dogma hæreticum, meretur in credendo. *Tolet* Instruct Sacerd. l. 4. c. 3. Non quomodo probet, sed quid dicat Ecclesia advertendum nobis est. *Stapleton.* Princ. Doct. Fid. l. 8. c. 9. Deus suis ministris, non secus ac sibi credi fidemq; adhiberi voluit. *Id.* c. 10.

† C. R. p. 68.

namely,

namely, that if God had not bestowed that Gift upon the Pope, he had not acted with common Discretion. *Aliter Deus non fuisset discretus.* But if you bethink your self, you will find this Argument prove every whit as well, that every particular Member of the Church ought to have been made Infallible, whereby to avoid all those Differences and Contests, you cannot deny to have often happened, even in your own pretended Infallible Church. If you please therefore, you may with at least as much Reason *think it inconsistent with the goodness of God,* not to make every Christian Man or Woman Infallible. But the Truth is, God of his infinite Wisdom and Goodness having given us an infallible *Rule,* the Holy Scriptures, which if duly attended to, † *are able to make a Man wise unto Salvation, through Faith which is in Christ Jesus,* let us but faithfully adhere to this Rule as the Primitive Christians did, and after their Example square our Conversations accordingly, and we shall not stand in need of an infallible Guide. And unless we do so, all the Infallibility in the World will not suffice to conduct us to Heaven. For which reason I can by no means understand, how *it is inconsistent with the Goodness of God* to leave us to the direction of this Rule, *without such an infallible Guide,* who was never Promised, either in the Old or New Testament; and who, if there were such an one, would be no more able to prevent, or silence all Heresy, or to cure all Divisions, than our Rule would do without him. Even the infallible Apostles themselves could not do it.

Rest. We take purely upon Revelation many things taught us, of the Nature, Power, Infinity, &c. of God.

---

† 2 Tim. 3. 15.

Vind.

Vind. You believe these Divine Attributes, you say, *purely upon Revelation.* But I hope it is because you find Reason to believe such Revelation; otherwise though the Revelation be most true, your belief of it is most unreasonable. So that after all you must confess, that * such Belief *is bottomed upon your Reason,* unless you will acknowledge your self and your Party to believe without Reason. Which will not be for the credit of your Faith.

Rest. These Matters of pure Revelation, are no Objects of Reason.

Vind. I grant our shallow finite Reason can by no means comprehend what is infinite; but yet it is certain Reason, as imperfect and defective as it is, if hearkened to, will direct us, as it did *Plato* and *Socrates* and others amongst the Wisest of the Philosophers, to some conception of the Divine Attributes, as not being matters of *pure Revelation,* as you would have them to be; tho' much better known by it. And as to those other Doctrines of the Blessed Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Resurrection of the Body, *&c.* which are matters of *pure Revelation,* tho' they are not properly *Objects* of our *Reason,* yet the Revelation that teaches them is. For I can never come to know that such *Revelation* is from God; and so to be believed, but upon the account of the Evidences it brings with it of it's Divine Original. And I can never come to understand these

---

* See what your own *Stapleton* says to this purpose. *Sine ullâ inquisitione & labore, veritatem omnem cognoscere, ad immediatam illam revelationem spectat, solis Prophetis & Apostolis propriam. —— Non autem ad eorum successores, & Ecclesiæ Ministros qui eos secuti sunt. Alioqui frustra & synodi convocarentur, & rerum sacrarum studia atque exercitia susciperentur, pastores quoque in Ecclesiâ non vigilantes, sed in utramque aurem dormientes statuerentur, multaq; alia absurda consequerentur.* Princip. fid. Doctrinal. Demonstr. Controv. 4. l. 8. c. 14.

but by the help of my Reaſon; nor exerciſe my Reaſon to nobler purpoſes than in Diſquiſitions of this Nature.

Reſt. No People in the World uſe it more in proper Caſes than we do.

Vind. Then pray Sir do not appropriate it to your ſelves, but allow us to uſe it too without blame.

Reſt. Only we captivate it when it pretends to meddle with things beyond its reach.

Vind. That is to ſay, you allow the uſe of it, in preſſing Perſons to come over to your Communion, but not at all when entered into it. And for this weighty Cauſe, that if it ſhould prove over-curious, and enquire into the nature of your Faith and Worſhip, it will ſoon diſcover you are not only Fallible, but have groſly and ſhamefully erred. Which is a Point that is not to be *meddled with*, and Reaſon is not to be heard when ſhe touches upon it. The ſhort of the matter is this. We are deſirous to hearken to, and be guided by Reaſon and Revelation, which if hearken'd to, totally overthrow your Church's Pretenſion. You on the other hand, are for diſcarding both theſe in behalf of your pretended Infallible Guide, or at leaſt for making them truckle to him. And which of us act moſt rationally in this Caſe, I could almoſt leave to your ſelf, in your more ſerious Retirements to determine.

Reſt. Your Author teaches, * that *God has given us no other Guide, but our own Reaſon, with the Aſſiſtance of his Grace, to believe in himſelf.*

Vind. That is to ſay, to believe his Being. This is all our Author could be ſuppoſed to mean by

---

* *C. R.* p. 70.

this

this Expreſſion, and I dare ſay you do not deny it.

Reſt. You ſee I have not denied it to be true.

Vind. What Exception then have you to it?

Reſt. Then we need no other Guide but our Reaſon, for thoſe other Articles of our Creed, the Trinity, Incarnation, Reſurrection, *&c.*

Vind. Have you proved this Conſequence?

Reſt. No; But I hope you will grant it without proof.

Vind. Indeed but I ſhall not. And if I may be allowed to make uſe of my Reaſon, I will tell you why I cannot grant it, namely, becauſe it is a falſe Conſequence, that no way follows from his Poſition, and ſo neither hurts our Cauſe, nor helps yours. And now Sir, what is become of the Contradictions you ſo inſultingly charge upon our Author?

Reſt. * *I ask him, whether he believes with leſs aſſurance the* Incarnation, Trinity, *&c. upon the Authority of Scripture, than he believes a* God *upon his Reaſon?*

Vind. And what if he believes them equally? He believes the Being of a God, becauſe his Reaſon tells him there muſt be, and is one, and that it is very fooliſh, as well as wicked to queſtion it. And what other Evidence have you for this great Fundamental Truth? He believes the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and the Doctrines contain'd in them to be infallibly true, and in particular thoſe relating to the *Incarnation, Trinity,* &c. becauſe his Reaſon tells him, he has infallible Evidence for the Truth of the Revelation, and the true ſenſe of it, wherein theſe Doctrines are contained. And by conſequence he believes both the

---

* Pag. 71.

Exiſtence of God, and the truth of the Doctrines revealed by him with the ſame aſſurance. And what *Linceus* can ſee any harm in this, or any damage to Chriſtianity? You may cry out againſt this Proceeding, but I am very ſure you will never prove it to be erroneous. And after all your vain Boaſts of Dr. *Tillotſon* and Dr. *Stillingfleet* being routed, by your beloved your * *Incomparable* Author of *Sure-footing*, I muſt beg leave to tell you, the *Rational Account*, as well as the *Rule of Faith*, wants yet an Anſwer ſtill, after all that has hitherto been ſaid againſt them. But becauſe I would not impoſe too great a Task upon you, I would only beg of you to try if you can confute only two Chapters in that *Account*: They are the fifth Chapter and the ſeventh of the firſt Part. And if you write no more till you have done this, to the ſatisfaction of Impartial Readers, I am ſatisfied we ſhall not hear of you again in haſt. In the mean time I am amazed, that you ſhould own your ſelf, *not more aſſured of the Being of a God, than of* your abſurd Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. And let me tell you, Chriſtianity and even natural Religion is very little beholden to you, for ſuch an impious Profeſſion as this is. And if this be the beſt way you have *of bringing your ſelves out of your Circle*, you had as good continue in it.

Reſt. Well, let us proceed.

Vind. Your long † Flouriſh about the Salvation of the Heathens I let paſs, as not at all to the

---

* For Roughneſs of Stile, Obſcurity of Expreſſion, vain Confidence and weakneſs of Argument, there are very few Writers, if ſo much as one, that may compare with this Author. And this is the only ſenſe I know of, wherein he can be juſtly ſtiled *Incomparable*: He is incomparably unpleaſing, unintelligible, and inconcluſive.

† Pag. 72, &c.

Caſe

Case of the Church of *England*, in which it is my Business to shew Salvation is much rather to be expected, than in yours of *Rome*. And the Case of the Heathens will not determine this Question, on either side.

Rest. This I must own. But let me ask, * *Does your Author think the holding of the* Three Creeds, *sufficient? If he does, then he thinks* Presbyterians,&c. *in a good State, tho' they be noted Schismaticks, and have no Ordinations nor Sacraments.*

Vind. Does he say any such thing?

Rest. He talks of † *Rage seen among the Zealots of our Church, when they hear of the Gospel being extended out of the pale of their Communion; tho' with* Christians, *who hold the three antient* Creeds, *and have every thing essential to a* Church, *except what* Rome *has made so,* viz. *The Universal and Unlimited* Sovereignty of her Bishop.

Vind. Does this look like declaring it sufficient barely to hold the three Creeds?

Rest. I cannot say that.

Vind. Where then is the Sincerity of misrepresenting his Words, as if he had? Here he supposes the Churches spoken of, to have each of them every thing essential to a Church. And what then becomes of your flirt at him, as if he were pleading for such as he owns not to have these Essentials? Certainly whatever Society of Christians has every thing Essential to a Church, you cannot deny them with any shew of Reason to be a Church, whether others be so or not.

Rest. That the Church of Rome *has made the* Unlimited Sovereignty *of her Bishop essential to a Church, is most untrue.*

Vind. I am glad to hear this; because hence it

---

* Pag. 77.

† *C. S.* p. 41

follows, that those that have all other *Essentials*, must be true Churches, tho' they do not own such an unlimited Sovereignty in the Pope, and by consequence tho' they do not own themselves his Subjects. And then it is to be hoped, we may come in time to some Accommodation. For which reason I must beg of you not to revoke this Acknowledgment.

Rest. As for the Cappadocian *Bishop* Firmilian, *I hope your Author will not deny he maintained a wrong Cause, against St.* Stephen; *yet in all his furious Violence, he never questioned Pope* Stephen's *Authority.*

Vind. I am no way concerned to engage in *Firmilian's* Dispute about Rebaptization. But I cannot think it a plain owning the Pope's Authority, that he expressly charges him with * *Inhumanity*, and *unworthy* Behaviour, with *Boldness* and *Insolence* and *Wickedness*, with *Breaking the Peace*, and *defaming the blessed Apostles St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, with *manifest Folly*, with *want of Zeal*, and *Shame*, with *Unskilfulness*, with causing *Strife and Contention in all Churches*, and with *great Sinfulness*. These are the Complements *Firmilian* bestows upon Pope *Stephen*; and if these be the best and most satisfactory signs he has given of his *not questioning* Stephen's *Authority*, we shall not envy you as many more of the same *stamp*, as you can desire.

XI. *Rest.* † *I must own your Author has an excellent*

---

* Per illius inhumanitatem — Non Stephanus beneficio & gratia digna commisit. Ne dum audacia & insolentia ejus meminimus, de rebus ab eo improbè gestis — Rumpens adversum vos pacem — Infamans Petrum & Paulum beatos Apostolos — Manifestam Stephani Stultitiam — Nullo adversus hæreticos zelo — Non pudet Stephanum hoc asserere — Qua imperitia — Lites & dissentiones quantas parasti per Ecclesias totius mundi? — Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti? *Inter B. Cypr. Epist.* 75.

† *C. R. pag.* 79.

Method

method of dealing with all sorts of Adversaries! When he has to do with Deists, *then the* Jews *understood those Prophesies of the* Messiah; *now he has to do with* Papists, *the* Jews *did not understand those Prophesies of the* Messiah.

Vind. What a mighty Business is here for you to be so witty upon? If the *Jews* some Ages before our Saviour, whilst they had the Prophets amongst them, understood the Texts referred to, of the *Messiah*; how does it follow, that the common People, and even their Priests and *Rabbies* could not possibly understand them otherwise in the Time of our Saviour's Incarnation? some Hundreds of Years after *Malachi*, who was called * חותם הנביאים the *Seal*, that is, the closing up or *finishing of the Prophets*, because the last of them. There is no Inconsistency at all in this, but both Assertions may very well be true, with respect to the different Times whereto what he says relates. And we are so little afraid of the *Detector*'s knowing what is here said, that if you please, you have free Liberty to acquaint him with it, and lay your Heads together to make the best use of it, for the Benefit of your Cause and Party, that you can.

Rest. Your Author makes his silly Lord speak foolishly, and then confutes him with a Magisterial Air.

Vind. Here you enter upon a long Excursion concerning the *Jews*, and make some Reflection, not over-pertinent, upon our Author's *Christianity demonstrated.* Which not concerning our present Controversy with the Church of *Rome*, I leave it to the Author himself, who is sufficiently able to take you to task for it, cou'd he think it

---

* D. Kimchi in Resp. c. Judæos, apud Lipman in Nitzach. p. 200.

worth his while. I am ſure I do not think it worth mine.

XII. *Reſt. Your Author* ſpeaking of private Judgments, ſays, * *It is all we have for the Belief of a God, or of Chriſt.*

Vind It is not to the Advantage of your Sincerity, that you did not add the next Words, † *and by your own Confeſſion for the Choice of a Church?* What reaſon had you for concealing this Paſſage? No good one I am ſure; only it was not for your purpoſe to recite it. You cannot deny that you allow of the Uſe of Reaſon, or private Judgment, call it whether you will, in getting People over to your Church, as I have noted before, but then they are to have nothing more to do with ſo dangerous a Weapon. You make a great Noiſe with the Notes of your Church, her pretended Antiquity, Univerſality, Viſibility, Miracles, Prophecy, and what not; which is a plain Appeal to our Reaſon; and ſo long as you hope theſe may prevail private Judgment does very well. But when once the Prey is caught, the Buſineſs is now done, and away with your private Judgment; that, as I ſaid, will be inquiring into the Corruptions of your Church, will take notice of their Diſagreeableneſs to the Holy Scriptures, will put Men upon *trying the Spirits whether they be of God*, and ſo may diſſettle Perſons, and make them ſeek out for another ſafer Communion. But now if I may uſe my own Reaſon in chooſing of a Church, why not as well in inquiring whether that Church require nothing of me that is apparently ſinful, either in Faith or Worſhip? Nothing can make a Difference in this Caſe, unleſs I can get into an infal-

---

* *C. R.* p. 88. † *C. S.* p. 46.

lible

lible Church, which is not to be hoped for in this World, where all Men are fallible; and unleſs I can moreover be infallibly aſſured that I am ſo, which I can never be, without the Exerciſe of my own private Judgment, or Reaſon. But I have already ſaid ſo much of this pretended Infallibility, that I need add nothing more concerning it here.

Reſt. The *ſhort* of what your Author ſays is this, * *we muſt truſt to our private Judgment in every thing.*

Vind. And what Argument do you bring againſt this? He does not ſay you are to truſt purely to this *private Judgment*, without uſing the beſt means of Information, ſuch as Reading the Holy Scriptures, which your Reaſon teaches you are the Word of God, and therefore the Rule of our Faith; an Enquiry into the Doctrines and Practices of the purer Times of Chriſtianity, which may help your Judgment in many caſes, to underſtand the true Senſe of Scripture, and of which your Reaſon teaches you alſo to judge by the Help of Scripture; the Judgment of your Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, to whom your Reaſon will direct you to pay a great Deference, tho' not intirely to reſign up your ſelf to it, *&c.* but only that as you make uſe of your Reaſon in all other Concerns of any Importance, ſo are you to do it more eſpecially in what is of the greateſt Concernment to you poſſible, the Eternal Salvation of your Soul. It is hard to conceive, that a Man ſhould be obliged to act rationally in all other leſſer Matters, as you cannot and will not deny, but muſt lay aſide his Reaſon and be hurried on blindfold, where his infinitely greateſt Intereſt is

* *C. R.* p. 89.

at ſtake : And if you think you can prove the contrary, be pleaſed to do it.

Reſt. How does this agree with what he ſays in the very next Anſwer, that there are many things which he takes purely upon Revelation, for his Reaſon could never have found them out, nor can perfectly underſtand them.

Vind. This is only an Anſwer *ad hominem,* and ſo his former Poſition might be nevertheleſs true, for its Diſagreement with this. But if you pleaſe a little to conſider, you will ſoon ſee they do not at all diſagree. Firſt, he ſays, *we muſt truſt to our Reaſon in every thing,* and then, *there are many things he takes purely upon Revelation, for his Reaſon could never have found them out, nor can perfectly underſtand them.* This looks as if you were afraid of making uſe of your Reaſon ; otherwiſe you could hardly ſuffer your ſelf to argue ſo weakly. For when he tells you, he takes *many things purely upon Revelation,* you cannot imagine he means, that he does not uſe his Reaſon in inquiring, both into the Certainty and the true Meaning of that Revelation. When he is once aſſured of both theſe, he may very ſafely rely upon the Revelation for the Truth of what it atteſts, tho' above the Comprehenſion of his Reaſon. But he muſt act very unreaſonably, if he have not firſt ſatisfied himſelf in both theſe reſpects, which he cannot do, but by the Help of his Reaſon or private Judgment. And by conſequence he might reaſonably enough ſay, that he truſts to his Reaſon even in theſe Matters of pure Revelation ; which tho' his Reaſon could never find out of it ſelf, yet could he never have known, whether they ought to be believ'd when diſcovered but by the Help of his Reaſon, teaching him that theſe Articles are thus revealed, and again, that whatſoever is thus revealed requires his undoubted Aſſent, even tho'

above

above the Reach or Comprehenſion of his Reaſon, which unaſſiſted by Divine Revelation could never have brought him to the Knowledge of them.

Reſt. Your Author * acquaints us, that *the Effects of private Judgment are theſe, multiplicity of Sects and Opinions, perpetual Wranglings, inveterate Prejudices, Animoſities, Strifes,* &c.

Vind. We are now got off from the Diſcourſe we were upon, the *Caſe Stated,* which you undertook to anſwer. However, that you may not think your ſelf neglected, I am content to follow you, and hear what you have to ſay farther of *private Judgment.* And I muſt acknowledge it is a ſorrowful Conſideration, that theſe are the too common Effects of the Abuſe of Reaſon, not of Reaſon it ſelf when duly attended to. But you cannot ſay, but he tells you of other worſe Effects of an implicit Faith, which you did not think fit to relate, becauſe you could not anſwer them. *The Queſtion,* he tells you, † *will now remain, whether greater* Miſchiefs and Inconveniences, *have befallen Mankind in the one way, or in the other, in following their* private Judgment, *or in ſubmitting* implicitly *to Authority.* And he gives you this notable Inſtance of the Difference between them, that *private Judgment can never be ſo fatally miſtaken, as in ſubmitting to* Authority, *if it ſhould* judge *wrong; becauſe in all other* Errors *it may be ſet right again, by ſtronger* Reaſons *being offered on the other ſide; but if a Man once* reſign *his* Reaſon, *and give it up abſolutely to* Authority, *there are no means left to retrieve him; if he has* judged *amiſs in the* Choice *of ſuch a* Guide, *whom he thinks to be* infallible, *he muſt then follow his* Guide, *tho' in all the wild* Deluſions *that are poſſible, for he muſt* examine *no more;*

---

* Chriſt. Demonſtr. p. 181, 182.

† Pag. 185.

his

his Principle *is to go on* blindfold ; *he hath plucked out his* Eyes, *that he may* see *the better.* But this not being proper to be told, it was therefore thought convenient to suppress it.

Rest. ‖ I know *it would be unreasonable to think there was nothing in the Nature of the infinite Being, which I did not comprehend. But I can't see how this proves that some things, which appear to be manifestly against Reason, are in the infinite Being ; for Example, that Three are One and One Three.*

Vind. I confess I cannot see, no more I am sure can you, or any one else, *how there being some things in the Nature of the infinite Being, which we cannot comprehend, should prove that there are some things in this infinite Being, that are manifestly against Reason.* Nor do I know what you mean by talking at this rate. For I am fully convinced, there is nothing *manifestly against Reason in the infinite Being*, and that our Author does not say there is. And if there be nothing *apparently against Reason* in the Deity, that some things in it are to us incomprehensible, will never prove there is. This you must inevitably own.

Rest. I give you an Instance of it in the Trinity, namely, that *Three are One, and One Three.*

Vind. This I grant is above our Reason, as every thing relating to a Spirit is. We know nothing of an immaterial Being, but by its Effects and Operations, and what wonder then if we know not how Three of them may be in one ? and yet it may be nevertheless true that they are so. We cannot understand how our Souls move our Bodies, nor how they will, or judge, or remember, or rejoice, or grieve, *&c.* and yet it is not the less certain that they do so : Which shews

---

‖ *C. R.* pag. 90.

plainly

plainly that they have a Nature and Faculties that are above our Comprehenſion, but not that they are againſt Reaſon. And the Caſe is much the ſame as to the Incomprehenſibility of the Divine Nature, which is owned to be above our Reaſon, but not being the proper Object of it, cannot be ſaid to be againſt it, any more than Geometrical Demonſtration can be ſaid to be againſt the Reaſon of an ignorant, illiterate Ruſtick, who has no Notion of any thing relating to the Mathematicks. Such an one cannot comprehend the Three Angles of a Triangle to be equal to Two right ones, that Parallelograms having the ſame Baſe, and being between the ſame Parallels are equal, or any other the like Problem. All this is pure Jargon to him, and he knows no more of it, than a deaf Man does of Muſick, or a blind Man of the Nature and Difference of Colours. Of which theſe are no more competent Judges, than a finite Underſtanding is of what is infinite, or one that converſes always with Matter and Body, of what is immaterial and incorporeal. Whence it appears that our not comprehending the great Myſtery of the Trinity in Unity, by no means argues any Inconſiſtency or Unreaſonableneſs in it, but merely the Weakneſs and Shallowneſs of our own Capacities. Three in One cannot be in material Beings; but that the Caſe is the ſame in relation to what is immaterial and ſpiritual, can never be made out. And to ſay that this Doctrine, tho' plainly revealed by Almighty God, is yet unreaſonable, or in your own Words, * that *it appears to be manifeſtly againſt Reaſon*, you muſt allow to be apparent Blaſphemy, till you can find out ſome gentler Term for it.

* *C. R.* pag. 90.

And here if I ſhould turn your own Artillery upon you with a little Variation, and tell you, *a* Deiſt *may laugh in his Sleeve, to hear ſuch Reaſons given* (againſt, rather than) *for our Myſteries*; and that *this is not defending, but expoſing* Chriſtianity, *and every true* Chriſtian *ſhould look with Horror upon theſe Blaſphemies againſt the Holy Trinity*, I cannot imagine what you would be able to ſay for your ſelf.

Reſt. * *Hitherto I believed your Author was an Enemy to the* Socinians, *and that he had an Orthodox Notion of the Holy Trinity; I find now I have been miſtaken, and according as he expreſſes his Belief of it, there is no* Sandius, Brenius, Clendon, *&c. in the World, but will readily ſubſcribe to it.*

Vind. You have a very aking Tooth at this Author, as if you had a mind to make him to be whatever he has written againſt. It is not long ſince you repreſented him, † as a Friend to Diſloyalty, and a Lover of War and Bloodſhed. Now he muſt needs be a Diſciple of *Socinus*. And next poſſibly you will make a *Papiſt* of him, juſt as you pleaſe. But at preſent as to *Socinianiſm* let me tell you, when you have written half ſo much, and to ſuch purpoſe, againſt that Hereſy, as he has done, it will be time enough then for you to accuſe, or me to vindicate him from this unjuſt Charge; of which I dare ſay you do not in your Conſcience believe him guilty.

Reſt. He ſticks at nothing to do all the Miſchief he can.

Vind. He is extremely obliged to you for ſuch a Character! But pray how do you make it out.

Reſt. He has heretofore defended Revelation *againſt the* Deiſts, Chriſtianity *againſt the* Jews, *and the*

---

* Pag. 91. † Pag. 26.

Trinity

Trinity *againſt the* Socinians ; *now in this Book he gives up* Revelation, Chriſtianity, the Trinity, *all that he may diſtreſs* Popery.

Vind. Since by your own Confeſſion, he has done ſuch excellent Service to our Religion, againſt theſe irreconcilable Enemies to it, as he has againſt others alſo, one would think you might have allowed him fair Quarter, if at laſt you had found him tripping. This not only Charity, but Equity would adviſe. But now if he is not guilty as you ſuppoſe, but what he ſays is capable of a fair Interpretation, what then will you ſay for your ſelf? Yet I ſee not but his ſaying may be underſtood in a ſound and inoffenſive Senſe, whether you think ſo or not. *Perſonal Actions*, ſays he, *are attributed to the Divine Three, therefore we call 'em Perſons.* What can this mean but that there being Three *Hypoſtaſes*, or Subſiſtences, in the Divine Eſſence, whereto proper Perſonal Actions are attributed in Scripture, they are therefore called Perſons? This is ſo natural a Senſe of his Words, that you could not tell how to frame your vain Objection againſt it, but by changing the Words and then arguing againſt them, not as he has ſpoken them, but as you have put them into his Mouth. He ſays, they are *called* Perſons becauſe of their Perſonal Actions ; you, that you might ſeem to have ſome Exception to him, repreſent him as ſaying, *they are Perſons only* becauſe of theſe Perſonal Actions attributed to them. Again ſay you, *If they are called Perſons only* ad captum, *and not that we ſhould think it really ſo, then we muſt not think there are any real Perſons in the Trinity.* Now here a little Ingenuity wou'd have directed you to read over his Words once more, before you had framed your Objection, and ſeen how little reaſon he had given for ſuch an Interpre-

terpretation, having expreſly declared, * there did not *come ſuch a Thought into his Head, as Three Perſons of Men.* Whence you might have ſatisfied your ſelf, when he ſays this Name is uſed *ad captum*, he means that it is in Condeſcenſion to our Capacities, and becauſe we know not how to expreſs our ſelves more clearly, that the Word *Perſon* is here uſed; not that the Three *Hypoſtaſes* ſignified by that Name would not have been the ſame they are, whether called by that Name or not. Then ſay you, *we muſt not think there are any real Perſons in the Trinity*, whereas he denies only ſuch *Perſons* as thoſe of *Men*; and ſuch you cannot pretend to ſay they are. And now what becomes of your ſhameful Exclamations about *execrable Blaſphemy, and ſticking at nothing* to do you *Miſchief*, giving up all *that he may diſtreſs Popery*? I add farther, what if you cannot clear your ſelf of having ventured to expoſe the very fundamental Articles of Religion, to ſerve your Cauſe, and ſo the Charge recoils upon your ſelf? This you have done too apparently, by ſetting your late Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation upon the ſame Foot with the Being of a God and all the Articles of the Creed, as if they had no better Foundation to ſupport them, than that has. Than which you could not well contrive to do a greater Miſchief to Chriſtianity, this being as much as in you lies, to ſap and undermine its very Foundation. Your next Section is too trifling to deſerve our notice; and the next after that not much better, where you are pleaſed to charge our Author with not being of St. *Auguſtin*'s Religion.

Reſt. † *Your Author's Lord propoſes a* Deiſtical *Queſtion, which is a little puzzling. What Authority,*

---

* *C. S.* pag. 48. † *C. R.* pag. 93.

ſays

ſays the Deiſt, *have you to believe Scripture. No Authority*, ſays your Author, *it is Evidence, and not Authority, upon which my Belief of the Scriptures is founded.*

XIII. *Vind.* Hence you triumphantly infer St. *Auguſtin* and him to be of different Religions, but for what reaſon? St. *Auguſtin*, I grant, profeſſes he * *would not believe the Goſpel, but for the Authority of the Church.* But it will be hard to tell the Difference between them. Our Author believes upon Evidence convincing his Reaſon, not upon any other ſort of Authority. St. *Auguſtin* believes upon the Authority of the Church, that is, of the Primitive, † not of the preſent Church, and not as || a Legiſlator, but as a Witneſs teſtifying the Goſpel to be the ſame that was taught by our Bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles; which in my judgment, comes to the ſame thing. So that theſe Two may very well agree together, and be of the ſame Religion, notwithſtanding your ſmart Obſervation to the contrary.

Reſt. He ſays farther, *I believe the Scriptures and the Facts therein related, upon the ſame, and much ſtronger Evidence, than I have for believing there was ſuch a Man as* Alexander, *or* Cæſar, *&c. or ſuch a Town as* Rome, *or* Conſtantinople, *&c.*

---

* Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Catholicæ Eccleſiæ commoveret Authoritas. *Cont. Ep. Man. Fundam.* c. 5.

† *So did* Gerſon, de Vit. Spirit. lect. 2. & *Durandus* l. 3. diſtinct. 24. quæſt. 1. *Tho. Waldenſ.* Doctrinal. Antiq. Fid. l. 2. c. 21. *Joh. Dried.* de Eccl. ſcript. & dogm. l. 4. c. 4. *Du Pin.* Diſſert. prelimin. l. 2. ch. 1. §. 8.

|| Ce n'eſt pas que l'Evangile tire en ſoi ſon Authorité de l'Egliſe: il l'a de Dieu même, qui l'a reveié & inſpiré. Mais on n'eſt ſeur de cette revelation, que par l'autorité de l'Egliſe, qui nous apprend que c'eſt ce même Evangile qui a été écrite par les Apôtres. *Du Pin* ibid.

Vind. And can you find fault with this? You must be in a very peevish Humour if you do.

Rest. To this the Deist *may easily reply, that the* Scripture *cannot* be believed upon the same Evidence, *much less* a stronger; *for no Man in his Senses ever denied there was such a Man as* Alexander, &c. *or that there is such a Town as* Rome, &c. *but thousands of learned Men have* denied *Scripture* to be the Word of God.

Vind. I thought the Inquiry had been, whether full and unexceptionable Evidence had been to be believed; but it seems, according to you, the Usage the Scripture has met with from perverse and obstinate Men, is the true Standard of its Credibility. Let it be ever so undeniable in it self, if it has had the ill Fate to be denied, little regard is thenceforward to be had to it. This is a way of arguing somewhat peculiar to your self; and I will not contend with you about it, but leave it to the Reader, to judge of it. Only this I would offer to his Consideration, that if the Opposition a Doctrine meets with, whether justly or unjustly, invalidates the Evidence alledged in its Defence, I am afraid the Case of your Church and its Doctrines is very bad, they having met with much greater Opposition, than the Holy Scripture has done. So that by this new invented Argument, all that you have been so long building is thrown down at one Stroke. I would also desire to be instructed, who those *thousands of learned Men* are, who have had the Hardiness to *deny the Scripture to be the Word of God.* If you mean the *Manichees,* or such other ancient Hereticks, or our modern *Quakers,* pray make the best you can of their Denial. If you know of any other Pretenders to Christianity that have done it, be so kind, as to let others know them too in your next Letter.

Rest. I

Reſt. I believe it, *ſays your Author*, from the Nature of the Evidence, which makes it impoſſible to concert ſuch a Lye; and to carry it on without being detected. *And yet your whole Reformation is grounded upon the Poſſibility of concerting ſuch a Lye.*

Vind. How do you make that out? The Argument is very ſound; but your Charge upon the Reformation needs good Proof.

Reſt. Don't you declare that the Church of Rome *concerted the Lye of Tranſubſtantiation, and carried it on without being detected? Sure you cannot deny this.*

Vind. I both can, and do deny it. In the firſt place I think this Inſtance not to be to the purpoſe, becauſe there is a great difference betwixt miſtaking the Senſe of a Text of Scripture, and propagating that Miſtake, which a Man may in many caſes do honeſtly, and others may be undeſignedly drawn into it; there is a great difference, I ſay, between the venting and propagating ſuch a Miſtake, and atteſting to the truth of a Matter of Fact, which they that atteſt it know not to have been done, or a Writing which the Atteſters know to be a Forgery. Honeſt and well-meaning Men may poſſibly be concerned in the one, but none but Knaves and Impoſtors can engage in the other. Upon which account the former may oftentimes prevail where the latter cannot. In the next place, I ſay, the erroneous Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, was ſo far from being concerted, and carried on without Detection, that it met with great Oppoſition from time to time. For not only the *Greek* Church and ſeveral others in the Eaſtern Part of the World, were irreconcilable Enemies to it, as Mr. *Claude* has proved at

---

* Reponſe à Monſieur Arnaud de la perpetuité de la Foy, *&c.*

large, but nearer home, it was oppoſed by *Bertram*, † *Rabanus Maurus*, || *Berengarius*, and ∴ others. It was detected and oppoſed, and tho' carried on with a high Hand, never had that univerſal Teſtimony given to it, that was to the Holy Scriptures. But you do not care what Hurt you do to them, ſo you can but think it ſubſervient to your Deſign of ſupporting the Doctrines of your Party, how erroneous ſoever.

XIV. *Reſt.* I have a great many Exceptions to make concerning the Canon of Scripture.

Vind. And I will anſwer them very briefly.

Reſt. 1. *What Churches were the* Goſpels, the Acts, Hebrews, *&c. ſent to, and what Church kept carefully the Originals, and ſent Copies of them to other Churches.* The Goſpels and Acts not being deſigned for any particular Church, but for the Benefit of the Church in general, it is moſt likely, that where-ever the Originals were, Authentick and well atteſted Copies were diſperſed over all Places where Chriſtianity had obtained; which were a juſt Foundation for there being received into the Canon of Scripture. The Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, if you will condeſcend to believe * St. *Chryſoſtome* and *Theodoret* † was written to the *Jews* eſpecially that dwelt in *Judæa* and *Paleſtine*, tho' not to theſe only, but to the diſperſed *Jews* alſo that

---

* De Corpore & Sanguine Domini. Vide etiam Prohibit. in indice Expurg. Madrit 1667. p. 98.

† Epiſt. ad Heribald. c. 33.

|| Apud Lanfranc. de Sacram. Euchariſt.

∴ Liſle's *Saxon Monuments*, *Biſhop* Coſin's *Hiſt. of Tranſubſtantiation*, c. 7.

* Πῶ ὑ ἔσιν ὅπε ἐπιςέλλει; ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ Παλαιςίνῃ. Præfat. in Epiſt. ad Hebr.

† Vid. Oecumen. Arg. Ep. ad Hebr.

were

were Believers. And so it was like to be sufficiently known before the Canon came to be settled.

Rest. II. *When an Epistle was sent to* Corinth, *every Member of that Church did not know the Apostles hand*, &c.

Vind. Nor was it necessary that every one should. When a Bull, an Indulgence, a Pardon, or any thing of that nature comes hither from *Rome*, it is not held necessary that you in particular, nor many others should know the Hand it comes in. Yet I do not think you reckon your self obliged to slight and reject it upon that account. So at *Corinth* it was sufficient, that the proper Judges there were fully convinced the Epistles they received were the Genuine Writings of the Apostle whose Name they bare, and that from thence the Church in all other Parts were fully assured it was so. For if * *in the mouth of two or three Witnesses every Word shall be established*; how much more in the Mouth of a whole Church at once? Especially when we know not at this distance, what other Evidence the Apostle himself might have given of it in the several places, where he had gone Preaching the Gospel? But you want us now to tell all the grounds the Primitive Church had for the reception of this or any other part of Scripture. A very wise and reasonable Demand.

Rest. III. Since this Method was so sure, and the Originals were extant, why was the *Canon not settled in the first Age?*

Vind. You would not have it settled before it was all written; which was not till very near the end of the first Century. So that all its Parts could

* 2 *Cor.* 13. 1.

not be then generally known. It is sufficient they were afterwards all received, tho' not all immediately, there having been some Dispute about the Epistles of St. *James* and *Jude*, the second of St. *Peter*, the Second and Third of St. *John*, that to the *Hebrews*, and the *Revelation*. That there was so, was *J. Toland*'s Objection before you. And one of his Answerers returns this Answer to it, which you may take also to your self. * "The "least we can make of this is, that the *Majority* "of *Christians* rejected those Writings, and that "too *a long time*. But *Eusebius*, from whom our "Author had his Intelligence, says otherwise, he "saith, those pieces are of the number ὡς ἀντιλε-"γομένων, but withal γνωείμων τοῖς πολλοῖς, i. e. *Gain-"said indeed* by we know not whom; but *received "by the Generality*. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 25. It seems "however they were rejected *by some*, and that "also *a long time*. I answer, they were all receiv-"ed as soon as the Churches had full Commu-"nication with one another, by the Convention "of Councils; which for *small* Books *containing "nothing that is singular*, was soon enough. And your own Mr. *Du Pin* † has considered this Objection somewhat more largely; and tells us *the sum of his Remarks is, that it was but a small number of the Books of the New Testament, whose Authority had been called in question, that there were but few Churches that doubted of them, and that their Doubt lasted not long*. Which is I think a full Answer to this Objection. But if any desire farther satisfaction concerning it, he may see this Point of the Canon of the New Testament throughly discussed in the forementioned *Defence of the Canon*

* Historical Account and Defence of the Canon of the New Testament. p. 82.

† Dissert. Prelim. l. 2. c. 1. §. 9.

of

of the New Teſtament in anſwer to *Amyntor*, this *Preliminary Diſcourſe* of Mr. *Du Pin* called in the Engliſh Tranſlation his *Compleat Hiſtory of the Canon and Writers of the Old and New Teſtament*; and in another moſt compleat Vindication of the New Teſtament, entituled, *The Canon of the New Teſtament vindicated, in anſwer to the Objections of* J. T. *in his* Amyntor; and written by the late admirably Learned Mr. *John Richardſon* formerly a Fellow of *Emmanuel* Colledge in *Cambridge*. Here he may find this Point fully argued without the help of *your Principles*; yet to the clear Conviction of *Toland*, and the *Free-thinkers*, and your ſelf together with them. Whereto give me leave to add that *Tertullian* * teſtifies the unqueſtionable, I may ſay the † Original Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, *ipſæ authenticæ litteræ eorum*, were read in their Churches in his time. And ſo they could have no pretence for doubting of their being what they were ſaid to be. And of the Goſpels *Irenæus* ſaith, they were delivered us || *to the intent they might be the Ground and Pillar of our Faith.* Such was the regard paid to the ſacred Writings in thoſe early times. And that they meet with a different treatment, from thoſe of your Communion now, is a Blot you will never be able to wipe off.

Reſt. IV. *As the moſt part of the Diſputes with the Antient Hereticks, was about the ſpuriouſneſs and genuineneſs of the Scriptures; if the Originals had been*

---

* De Præſcript. hæret. c. 36.

† *Authenticas*, inquit Quintinus, *literas* Apoſtolorum vocat. Apoſtolorum manu Scriptas, aut Subſcriptas, ut ab Ulpiano dicuntur *authenticæ tabulæ*, *authenticæ rationes*, *authenticum Teſtamentum*; quod diſtinguitur ab exemplo teſtamenti, l. 4. F. Fa. erciſc. lib. ult. F. de Teſtament. Vulgus appellat Originalia, &c. *Pamel.* in loc.

|| Adv. hæreſ. l. 3. c. 1.

extant, the producing of 'em would have ended the Dispute, without any more ado.

Vind. Will you undertake for this? Are you so fond of the Antient Hereticks, and Antiscripturists, as that you will take upon you to be their Compurgator? Or dare you answer for them, that they all knew the Hands of the Evangelists and Apostles so perfectly, as that a sight hereof would have presently silenced them? I cannot possibly think you believe this. And therefore I shall not take pains to confute it. But as *Abraham* said in another case, concerning the rich Man's Five Brethren whom he had left behind him upon Earth, * *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded, though one rose from the Dead*; so shall I say of these Disputers. If they would not be convinced by such Evidence as had satisfyed the Universality of truer and better Christians, neither would they have owned their Error, tho' even the Originals of the Scripture had been laid before them. And for any thing you know to the contrary this Trial might have been actually made of a great part at least of them, tho' without your supposed success.

Rest. V. St. *Ignatius in Ep.* ad Philad. seems to be of a contrary Opinion to yours; as also was Mr. *Dodwell*, and perhaps *Eusebius* too.

Vind. As to St. *Ignatius*, you must change his Word ἀρχαίοις into ἀρχέοις, and without the Authority of any MS. to warrant it, before you can make it bend at all to your purpose. Nor will this do neither, for supposing such an alteration made, I cannot imagine how this will shew that truly Primitive Bishop and Martyr, to be in any wise *of a contrary Opinion to ours.* And you have

---

* St. Luk. 16. 31.

not

not been pleaſed to tell us, how we might find it out. Mr. *Dodwell* was a Man of great Learning and Piety; but *aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus*; You know we did not believe him Infallible. And though the ſevere Perſecutions the Chriſtians were expoſed to might poſſibly occaſion the original Scriptures to be more concealed, than otherwiſe they would have been, yet it muſt be owned the Copies of them were diſperſed amongſt the Chriſtians, as appears from the frequent Expreſſions taken from them by the Writers of thoſe times, tho' perhaps without naming the Authors from whom they had them; and were moſt of them owned as the true and genuine Works of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, whoſe Name they now have; and conſequently as Canonical and undoubted Scripture; it being *morally impoſſible*, as Mr. *Richardſon* well argues, * *to ſuppoſe, that Pieces wrote, or authoriſed by the Apoſtles, ſhould not be eſteemed* Canonical or Rules of Faith *by all Chriſtians, to whom they were communicated, ſince the knowledge which they had of the Doctrine of Faith, was entirely derived from them and their Inſtructions. Euſebius*, as you ſay, *complains* of the *Artemoniſts*, for corrupting *the Scriptures then received*, but you add, *he has not one word of the* firſt Originals *of the* Apoſtles, *nor ſays the Hereticks were brought to this Teſt.* Yet it is certain he ſays, *they adulterated the plain and ſincere Faith of the ſacred Writings.* Which plainly implies that they had thoſe Holy Writings, ſuch as were known to be ſo, and perhaps the Originals themſelves, if they deſired to ſee them. So that theſe three Authorities all leave you, juſt where you was before.

---

* Can. of N. T. vindicated p. 87.

Reſt.

Reſt. Suppoſe the Originals were then extant, might not Chriſtians have conſpired, to ſay they were divinely inſpired.

Vind. To ſhew your great Zeal for Chriſtianity, you are ſtill arguing for the *Deiſts*; and * if your Religion teach you this, it muſt needs be a wicked one; for otherwiſe it would never put you upon ſtudying to explode Divine Revelation, and repreſent it all as a trick and impoſture. But that the Scriptures were written by Divine Inſpiration has been ſo often proved, againſt the Antiſcripturiſts, that I ſhall not now enter upon a farther Proof of it, here in the end of this Dialogue, but leave the Reader to conſult ſome of the many Authors who have written upon this Subject, and amongſt others the two forementioned Anſwerers to *Amyntor*, who have ſo worthily taken pains to clear this Point. Eſpecially ſince this is no part of the Controverſy I deſign'd to engage in, namely of the matters in Diſpute betwixt the Church of *England* and that of *Rome*.

XV. *Reſt.* * *Remember Sir I have anſwered your Author's Objections, againſt the Infallibility of the Church.*

Vind. The Infallibility of your Church is a *Trojan* Horſe, that has a whole Army of Deluſions in it, whereby it prepares it's Votaries to ſwallow all ſort of Corruptions without Chewing; as Experience ſadly teſtifies. But pray Sir remember on the other hand, that I have inquired into your

---

* When the Romiſh Orders do thus Argue *pro* and *con*, there is appointed one of the Learned of thoſe Convents to take Notes and to judge: And as he finds their Fancies, whether for *Preſbytery*, *Independency*, *Anabaptiſm*, *Atheiſm*, ſo accordingly they be to Act, and to exerciſe their Wits. *Biſhop* Bramhal *to Primate* Uſher. Let. 293.

† C. R. p. 97.

bold

bold Pretences to it, and ſhewn them to be all Groundleſs and Precarious, and what you can never Maintain; that you have no Foundation for them in Scripture, that your Reaſons for them are inſufficient, and that your Errors and Corruptions are an irrefragable Confutation of them. I have noted alſo that you are far from being infallibly agreed amongſt your ſelves, where this pretended Infallibility is ſeated, whether in the Church Diffuſive, or Repreſentative, and if in the latter, whether in the Pope alone, the Pope and his Cardinals, a Council alone, or a Council only when confirmed by the Pope. Nor was it known to Primitive Antiquity, any more than it is to us. And moreover had you really any ſuch mighty Privilege, which from the foregoing Conſiderations it is certain you have not, it would yet be of no advantage to far the greateſt part of your Church, unleſs their Prieſts who are to inſtruct them, were each of them Infallible, which, after all your Boaſts in this kind, you cannot pretend. So that in my Opinion you had much better have let alone this Brag, of having proved your Infallibility, when I have ſhewn ſo plainly, that you neither have, nor can prove it. But big Words many times do Buſineſs; and you are reſolved to try what uſe you can make of them. *This alone* you ſay *is a compleat Anſwer to our Authors whole Book*, being no leſs than *Demonſtration*. But all I can find it *Demonſtrates*, is only that you are willing to beg the Queſtion, and then try what Superſtructures you can build upon it. But pray Sir remember the Danger of building upon a ſandy Foundation, leaſt your Building fall and bury you in it's Ruins. Infallibility is too high a Claim to be granted you without good Proof; for want of which, your falſly pretended Infallible Church's Condemnation of our Author's Book, will do it

no

no manner of harm. Yet upon this falſe Pretence you ſeem to value your ſelf, as if all Opponents, though with ever ſo much Reaſon on their ſide, muſt preſently fall before you. It is but getting your pretended Infallible Church, to paſs her Cenſure upon them, which ſhe is ready to do upon all Occaſions, and the Buſineſs is done. This were an eaſy Conqueſt, if there were any thing in it; but as the Caſe now ſtands I am apt to think, you will meet with few of your Adverſaries ſo weak, as to be affrighted with ſuch a *Brutum fulmen*, ſuch a harmleſs Crack as this is.

XVI. To conclude I am now pretty well tired with this long Converſation; and ſhall not ſtand to take notice of your witty Flouriſh, upon our *petty Scribblers* and their *Objections*. But I muſt not wholly paſs by your Complaint of not being permitted to Print on your ſide; whereas you actually do it, and this Letter now before me is full Proof againſt you, together with ſeveral other Books I could name, that you can Print upon Occaſion. Only becauſe you do it by Connivance, and not with publick Licenſe, this ſerves for a Pretence for not having anſwered ſuch Books as none of you could anſwer when you had the greateſt freedom of doing it, as I have already told you. For my own part, I heartily wiſh our Superiors would think fit to let you looſe to write as you pleaſe, having learnt from the Experience we had formerly of your performances in this kind that you would do your own Buſineſs moſt effectually. And if you cannot make good your Pretences by Writing, upon Study and Deliberation, I take it for granted you cannot hope to do it better by a verbal Conference, which you ſeem to offer at, but I am confident you would find out ſome pretence to decline it, were your Challenge accepted. You may, and I do not doubt but you have a very good

Opinion

Opinion of your own Ability; but pray Sir remember, when there was a ſolemn Debate of this Nature, before ſome of the greateſt Perſons of the Kingdom, who they were that got the Victory to ſuch a Degree, that they were ordered not to give an Account of what had paſſed. I would not go about to leſſen your Skill in Controverſy, or in any wiſe to diſparage you, but I hope I may ſay without Offence, that you are hardly better-qualified for ſuch an Engagement, than thoſe who were choſen for that ſolemn Debate; which yet ſucceeded ſo ill on your ſide. The fault was not in the Advocates, but in the Cauſe they had undertaken to maintain; and ſince that ſtill remains, how ingenious ſoever you may be, it would be no ill Advice to you, to conſider before-hand, and take warning by them. Thus Sir I releaſe you at preſent, begging Pardon for the trouble I have hitherto given you; and not deſigning to interrupt your Studies any farther, till you ſhall think fit to give occaſion for it by a ſecond Letter.

Your Humble Servant

Feb. 27.

Philalethes.

ERRATA.

PAge 3 *l.* 10 *r. any Harm. p.* 9 *l.* 32. *for the r. that p.* 29 *l.* 16 *r. and* Socrates. *p.* 89 *l.* 13. *d. VIII.*

THE

CONTENTS.

INtroduction pag. 3
I. *No Danger of Salvation from any thing in the Church of* England. pag. 4
II. Rome *not the Mother Church* pag. 5
III. *The* Roman *Pretences to an universal Supremacy.* pag. 6
No Promise of this in Scripture ibid.
Nor does it belong to the Church, by Virtue of the Pope's Succession to St. Peter pag. 7
Scriptures silence an Argument against it pag. 9
What Supremacy the Popes claim pag. 10
Thou art Peter, *&c. no Proof of it* pag. 12
Nor was so understood by the Fathers pag. 13
In what Sense the Church may be said to be built upon St. Peter pag. 19
A Recapitulation of the foregoing Pages pag. 20
Of our Saviour's Command to feed his Sheep and Lambs pag. 21
St. Peter *sent by the Apostles to* Samaria p. 24
St. Paul *withstood him to the Face.* pag. 25
A Mistake about Jethro pag. 27
Of Joab's *withstanding* David ibid.

And

And St. John Baptiſt *withſtanding* Herod p. 28
What Proof that the Heathens were convinced of the Chriſtians believing St. Peter's *Supremacy* ibid.
The Care of all the Churches was upon St. Paul pag. 30
Some Paſſages out of the Acts of the Apoſtles, conſidered pag. 35
The Council at Jeruſalem *bears no Teſtimony to St.* Peter's *Supremacy* pag. 36
St. Peter's *ſuppoſed Supremacy, no Proof that the Pope is Supreme.* pag. 41
Beſides we have good Evidence againſt this Pretence pag. 44
The Teſtimonies of Proſper *and* Leo *conſidered* pag. 50
IV. *Of the Unity of the Church* pag. 54
Whether the Council of Trent has taught new Articles of Faith pag. 59
Whether the Sacraments are a Part of our Faith pag. 61
Of our Sects and Diviſions ibid.
V. *Of the Greek Church* pag. 63
Of the Original and Progreſs of the Romiſh Innovations pag. 64
Whether the Greeks owned the Roman Supremacy? pag. 66
Of Appeals to Rome pag. 70
VI. *Their pretended Infallibility* pag. 76
Whether the Jewiſh *Church erred in their Doctrine* ibid.
By the Church of Rome *meant all in Communion with the* Roman *Dioceſe* pag. 78

God's

God's Promises never fail, where the Condition implyed is observed pag. 79
The Church of Rome *not Infallible* pag. 81
Nor would it's Infallibility be of such universal Influence as they pretended pag. 85
VII. *The Miracles of the Church of* Rome p. 88
VIII. *Of their Reliques* pag. 90
The Reflections on the Devotions of the Church of *Rome* pag. 92
IX. *The* Romish *Legends* pag. 93
X. *Our Authors Charge of the* Romanists *Arguing in a Circle* pag. 94
Of Implicit Faith pag. 95
Of the necessity of an Infallible Guide ibid.
The use of Reason in Matters of Religion p. 96
XI. *Whether the* Jews *understood the Prophecies of the* Messiah pag. 102
XII. *Of Private Judgment* pag. 104
Effects ascribed to it pag. 107
Mr. L. *no Favourer of the* Socinians pag. 110
XIII. *The Foundation of our Belief of the Scripture* pag. 112
XIV. *Of the Canon of Scripture* pag. 116
XV. *Objections against the Romish Infallibility* pag. 122
XVI. *The Conclusion* pag. 124

This should be placed truly before the Postscript

THE CASE RESTATED, &c.

The CASE restated;

OR AN

ACCOUNT

OF A

CONVERSATION

WITH A

PAPIST,

CONCERNING

A Book intitled, *The Case Stated between the Church of* Rome, *and the Church of* England, &c.

In a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend in *London*.
Very fit to be bound up with the said Book.

The Second Edition.

Out of thine own Mouth will I judge, thee thou wicked Servant. Luke xix. 22.

Printed in the Year M.DCC XIV.

Price one Shilling.

AN

ACCOUNT

OF A

CONVERSATION, &c.

LETTER I.

SIR,

OME few Days ago I receiv'd with Thankfulness the Book you were pleas'd to send me. I read it first my self with an extreme Satisfaction, and then, according to your Orders, I carry'd it to our *Popish* Friend, fully assur'd it would make

Case stated.

make a deep impreſſion upon him, and bring him to renounce a ſuperſtitious Religion, ſo prejudicial to his Intereſts both in this World and in the next.

I found him at home in a violent Fit of the Gout, but muſing and thoughtful as he uſually is. I ſpoke to him with all the Earneſtneſs Religion and Friendſhip cou'd inſpire me. *Sir*, ſays I, *what bewitches you to ſtick ſo unaccountably to your nonſenſical Error? It alone hinders you from being pleaſing to your Friends, ſerviceable to your Country, and acceptable to God himſelf. I have often attempted to diſſuade you from it: You have been always untractable, but perhaps it was becauſe my Reaſons were not to your liking. You have often ſaid, that if any cou'd convince you of your Error, you would readily forſake it. Now, Sir, the Time is come that you can alledge no Excuſe. I have here a Book lately publiſh'd, that clears all Difficulties: It abſolutely confounds the Church of* Rome. *'Tis look'd upon by the Chiefeſt of ours as unanſwerable. You may judge by what the ingenious* Examiner *ſays of it, how univerſally it is eſteem'd. Read it then, dear Friend, and for your Soul's ſake, read it with Attention. I don't doubt but it will throughly convince you; and by this means you'll give your Friends the Comfort of ſeeing you repent of your former Errors, and become a true Member of the national Church of* England.

Examin. Aug. — 1713.

Upon this I offer'd him the Book, which he receiv'd with a Diſdainful Smile. And, *Sir*, ſays he, *I thank you for your Kindneſs, and for the Concern you ſhew for my Spiritual*

Spiritual and Temporal Interests. They are the most Cogent Motives to induce a Man to comply with any thing. You may be sure I have not been unmindful of 'em. I will keep the Book, and read it with Attention, as you desire; and when you honour me with a visit, some few Days hence, I'll give you sincerely my Opinion of it.

Then I assur'd him, that the Week following I wou'd wait upon him again; and accordingly I did. As soon as he perceiv'd me, he cou'd not forbear his Disdainful Smile. I was moved at it a little, and ask'd him abruptly whether he had read the Book, how he lik'd it, and what Effect it had produc'd in him.

Dear Friend, says he, *I have read attentively your Book, I have impartially examin'd it, and I have sincerely condemn'd it. I have found it like other Books against* Popery: *It is made up of nothing but notorious Untruths, manifest Contradictions, false Suppositions, wrong Quotations, and foolish Banters. The Author makes his Silly Lord represent falsely our Opinions, or answer foolishly his Objections. In a Word, he puts in his Mouth what he pleases, makes all pass for our Doctrine, and then refutes it as he pleases: This is, in short, the Character of the Book. I don't desire you shou'd believe me upon my bare Word; if you think it worth your While, we will read it together: I'll examine it Paragraph by Paragraph; and I engage to shew you, in a Short, Plain, and easy Manner, that I have given it its true Character, notwithstanding the General Ap-*

plaiſe it has met with among thoſe of your Party.

I muſt own, this unexpected Harangue provok'd me more and more. I cou'd not believe he was able to perform his Engagement; but I was willing to try what he cou'd do. Without Heſitation I accepted his Offer, and deſir'd him to begin the Examination of each Paragraph, which he did readily in this manner.

SECT.

SECT. 1.

YOU ſee, Sir, your Author's Firſt Paragraph. Can there be any thing more ſhamefully unjuſt? He fixes an Opinion upon us, and then refutes it with a triumphing Air. What *R. Catholick* ever deny'd *Jeruſalem* to be the Mother Church, in the Senſe this Author ſpeaks of! We all own, that, in Priority of Time, other Churches might be before the *Roman*, and in that Senſe preciſely be either Mothers, or Siſters to her, as you pleaſe. How often have you been told that the Motherhood of *Rome* conſiſts not in a Priority of Time, but of Dignity and Juriſdiction, grounded upon Saint *Peter*'s Primacy? Many Churches in *Great Britain* were before that of *Canterbury*; and can your Author deny that *Canterbury* is their Metropolitan or Mother Church? The Church of *Jeruſalem* was before that of *Ceſarea*, yet *Ceſarea* was made her Metropolitan and *Antioch* her Primate. In the ſame manner *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, and all other Churches, founded before the *Roman*, were made afterwards ſubject to her, and for this reaſon, *Juvenal*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, ſaid in a General Council, receiv'd even by thoſe of your Ch—h, that

Caſe ſtat. *pag.* 2. (1)

The Firſt Anſwer to the Lord refuted.

Concil. Eph. p. 2. Art. 5. in relat. ad. *Cœlest.* *the Ancient Custom and Apostolical Tradition was, that the Church of* Antioch *was to be govern'd and judg'd by the* Roman.

Case stated, *page* 2. (1) 1. But this is not all. I'll expose further your Auther's disingenious Dealing. He makes *Jerusalem* the Mother Church, because she was *before* that of *Rome*. According to this Notion, all Motherhood and Fatherhood imply a Priority of Time: If so, then the Queen is not Mother of any of her People older than her self; yet how often do your's call her the *Nursing Mother of the Church*, &c. Kings cannot be called *Patres Patriæ*, for the same Reason. A Minister in his Parish, a Bishop in his Diocese, shou'd never be called *Fathers* by any older than themselves; and so, *Right Reverend Father in God* is a downright Usurpation. Curious Thoughts indeed! But till we see Princes, Bishops, Ministers, *&c.* refuse this Title, I hope, Sir, you'll think your Author (at least) in a Mistake, and blame him for using such mean Shifts to refute our Doctrine.

Page 4. (2) *The 2d Answer refuted.* (2) His second Paragraph is of the same stamp with the first. See, Sir, how he imposes upon us again. Do we deny that this Motherhood of which we speak, may be translated from the City of *Rome* to some other Place? We allow the Primacy to be in Saint *Peter*'s Successor; wherever he goes he carries it with him: Whether he has a Particular Diocese or has not, 'tis the same thing: The Primacy is in his Person, and not

not in the Place of his Reſidence. This is our Opinion; and your Author muſt be ſtrangely malicious if he knew it, or ſtrangely ignorant if he did not. Men of Learning may eaſily diſcover the Impoſture; but are moſt of his Readers ſuch? They take all upon Truſt, without any further Examination. Let a thing be never ſo untrue, they believe it upon his Word againſt us; and thus we are always us'd by your Author and thoſe of his Party; A convincing Proof of their Zeal for Juſtice and Truth!

3. He goes on, and ſays that the *Church of* Rome *is not once nam'd in all the new Teſtament.* But, Sir, is the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* to the *Romans* no part of the New Teſtament? At leaſt it makes mention of a Church at *Rome*, and gives it the higheſt Commendations. If your Author denies this Epiſtle to be Scripture, then I know where to have him: If he owns it to be St. *Paul*'s, then I hope he will own his own Miſtake, and at the ſame time repair the Wrong he has done us by his falſe Aſſertion. This he is bound to do in Honour and Conſcience. Ib. *pag.* 4. Rom. c. 1.

4. As to what your Author adds, we own there *is no Promiſe* made to the City of *Rome, nor the leaſt Intimation of her being Head of the Churches, or the Standard or Center of Unity to 'em all.* The Promiſes were made to Saint *Peter*, and in him to his Succeſſors. This is the whole Matter in Diſpute; yet to hear your Author ſpeak, who Ib. *pag.* 4.

Sup. page 4. (2) Vide *Hieronymum* ctra. *Jov.* l. 2. *Cypriauum* de un. Ec. opt. ctr. *Par.* l. 2. *Chr.* in c. 21 *Jo.* Hom. 87. &c.

cou'd think it is? Sir, I have said it already, the Primacy is in Saint *Peter*; he *was the Head of the Church, the Standard and Center of Unity.* This he was wherever he went; he has left the same Power to his Successors. They have it wherever they go; and were *Rome* sunk in the Bottom of the Sea, their Supremacy wou'd be still the same, and own'd as such by all Faithful *Christians.*

Ib. *pag.* 4.

5. But *the Scriptures are silent*, says your Author, *concerning the suppos'd Universal Supremacy of Saint* Peter, *or that he ever was at* Rome, *or Bishop of* Rome. And, pray Sir, what then? Must nothing be believ'd but what is in Scripture? Does the Scripture mention every Place where every Apostle preach'd the Gospel, or of which they were Bishops? What mention does the Scripture make of *Andrew, Bartholomew, Thomas, &c.* and must we believe they did nothing, or never were in those Countries where Tradition assures us they exercis'd their Apostolical Functions? Sir, tho' Scripture makes no mention of St. *Peter*'s being at *Rome*, or Bishop of *Rome*, yet Tradition does. We believe it upon this, as we do other things of the utmost Concern: The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, the Canonicalness of such and such Books, *&c.* no Man, till unhappy *Calvin*'s Days, ever doubted of Saint *Peter*'s being at *Rome*, or of his being Bishop there; 'twas a Fact so notorious among the Ancients, that they made Saint *Peter*'s being at *Rome*, and the Succession of Bishops from him, a distinctive

Cyp. Ep. 2. ad *Antoni.* &c. *Aug.* ctra *Ait. Pet.* & Ep. *ad Gener. Optat.* l. 2. con. *Parm. Hier.* in *Cas.* &c. *Severus Sul.* lib. 2. Hist. &c.

distinctive Sign of the True Church: And the most Profligate Hereticks had not the Impudence to deny a Truth so universally receiv'd among *Christians*.

6. Your Author owns *some After-writers have mention'd it*; but then he says *that it is far from such an Universal Tradition, as is sufficient for the mighty Superstructure which is rais'd upon it.* Very well, Sir: But can he shew such an *Universal Tradition* for the Genuiness and Inspiration of the H. Scriptures? Till of late, none ever doubted that Saint *Peter* was at *Rome*, but how many have not only doubted, but have also positively affirm'd in all Ages, that all, or some, or most part of the Old and New Testament was fictitious or corrupted? If then what these Writers mention, without any Contradiction of St. *Peter*'s being at *Rome*, *be far from such an Universal Tradition, as is sufficient for the mighty Superstructure which is rais'd upon it*; how can what other Writers say, tho' condradicted by Multitudes, *be sufficient to raise upon it a* greater *Superstructure, viz.* The Genuiness and Inspiration of such and such Books, call'd Scripture? This is worthy your Author's utmost Attention, and let him answer it if he can. Ib. *pag.* 4.

7. But tho' it shou'd be granted that St. *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, says your Author, it *signifies nothing*: And why? Because, 1. *All is founded upon some Words said to Saint* Peter, *which cannot be strain'd to such an universal Supremacy as the Popes have claim'd.* 2. Nor were *so understood by the Primitive Church* Ibid. *Page* 5.

Church. Pray, Sir, what does he mean by *such an universal Supremacy as Popes have claim'd*? Some Popes have *claim'd* a Temporal, as well as a Spiritual *Supremacy*: Your Author shou'd know this is no part of our Faith. Popes are Men, and have their Failings, as others have; they may mistake and misuse their Power, and have often done so; but what is that to us, who condemn their personal Faults, and admit their lawful Authority? A King may mistake and misuse his Power, but does that make him forfeit his Right, or must his People believe he is no more God's Vicegerent? I hope your Author is not of this Opinion, and that whatever his Religion is, he has not forsaken his Principles of Loyalty. That the Passages he quotes *cannot be strain'd to the* Pope's Temporal *Supremacy*, and *that they were not so understood in the Primitive Church*, I will not deny; but I deny that they are not sufficient Proofs for the *Spiritual Supremacy* which all Popes have *claim'd*, or that they *were not so understood in the Primitive Church.* This your Author shou'd have refuted with some solid Reason, instead of a bare Affirmation; he found himself unable to do it, and very wisely refers us to a Book that quite ruins his own Pretensions; for he owns *Dupin* wrote it in defence of the Four Propositions of the *Gallican* Church: And, Sir, will your Party allow of the Doctrine contain'd in those four Propositions? If they do, I promise 'em we shall have no further Dispute with

Ib. pag. 5.

'em

'em about the Pope's Supremacy, and that they shall be receiv'd into our Communion, without granting any more to the Pope than is expres's'd in the four Propositions.

8. Now your Author thinks fit to quote Fathers, and shew his Erudition; but to be plain with you, Sir, he seems to be so little vers'd in 'em, that one wou'd be tempted to believe he never read 'em, but in some Pamphlet against *Popery*. *'Tis the current Sense of the Fathers*, says he, *that the Rock upon which* Christ *said he would build His Church, was not* Peter, *but the Faith which* Peter *then confess'd*. An Acute Observation! But we defye him and all his Party together, to shew any Passage of any Father that excludes Saint *Peter*. I own some of 'em look upon the Passage of Saint *Matthew* as having Two Senses, and sometimes they take it in one Sense, and sometimes in another, but, as I said before, never to the Exclusion of Saint *Peter*. And since he thinks fit to quote so many Fathers for one Sense of this Passage, I think fit to quote as many for the other. Case stated, *p.* 5.

Cyp. lib. 4. Epist. ad Pupi. 9. *Basil.* ad c. 2 *Isai.* & cont. *Eunom.* *Chryso.* Hom. in *Pet.* & *Pa.* *Hier.* in cap. 16. *Mat.* *Aug.* Ser. 15 de San. *Cyril.* lib. 2 in *Joa.* c. 12. &c.

9. *There is nothing*, adds your Author *that is said of Saint* Peter, *is so expres's as what Saint* Paul *says of himself*, That *the Care of all the Churches lay upon him*; and again, *So ordain I in all Churches*. This is a bold Affirmation, but where is the Proof to back it? How often has this Objection been answer'd? Yet your Author takes no notice on't, and speaks as if no Answer had been ever made.

made. *The Care of all the Churches*, founded by S. *Paul* himfelf, or committed to his Care, *lay upon him*, and he *ordain'd in 'em* what he thought expedient for their Good; and this was a Care of Juſtice and Juriſdiction, but no *Care of* other *Churches lay upon him*, but that of Charity and Compaſſion: And is there any *Catholick* Biſhop without this Care? Yet they lay no claim to any Supremacy upon that account. *Feed my Sheep*, &c. is more expreſs to prove Saint *Peter*'s Primacy, then any your Author has mention'd for Saint *Paul*; at leaſt the Holy Fathers thought it ſo, ſince none of 'em deny the Supremacy to Saint *Peter*, and not one of them give it to Saint *Paul*; and yet I believe they were as able to underſtand the Scripture, as your Author, or any other *Proteſtant* Writer. *If ſuch a Decretal cou'd be produc'd of St.* Peter's *Supremacy, I doubt not*, ſays he, *it would have been made uſe of towards proving his Univerſal Supremacy.* An Ingenious Conjecture! And what then; May not the ſame Words be us'd to ſignify a King's Power and a Magiſtrate's? Yet the King's Power implies Independance, and the Magiſtrate's Subordination: The Word *Authority* is of a Different Signification, when it is apply'd to a King, and when apply'd to a Magiſtrate. Your Author ſure will not deny this; and what then does his Conjecture ſignify?

Phil. Pres. in Con. Eph. c. 16. Greg. Mag. lib. 4. Ep. ad Mau. Aug. &c.

10 But, continues he, *There's not a Word in the* Acts, *of Saint* Peter's *being at* Rome. Well, and ſuppoſe we grant that Saint *Peter*

Caſe ſtat. page 6.

Peter was not at *Rome* when the *Acts* were written, what can your Author make of this Conceſſion againſt Saint *Peter*'s Primacy, or his Apoſtolical Function in *Rome?* Sir, I ſuppoſe your Author takes the Fathers to be credible Witneſſes, or elſe why does he quote 'em, to juſtify his Senſe of the Sixteenth of *Matthew?* But I hope he does not expect they ſhould be believ'd only when they ſpeak in his Favour. The Fathers then unanimouſly aſſure us that Saint *Peter* was in *Rome*, preach'd the Goſpel in *Rome*, and ſuffer'd Martyrdom in *Rome*. Is it credible that they ſhou'd all conſpire to deceive Poſterity, merely to tell a lye, by which they could reap no Advantage? No, Sir, I ſhall never look upon ſuch great Men to have been ſuch Knaves or Fools. Saint *Luke* ſays nothing of Saint *Peter*'s being at *Rome*, neither does he ſay any thing of St. *Paul*'s being in *Arabia*; and muſt we hence infer that Saint *Paul* was not there? You ſee, Sir, how far this ſort of Logick would go, and that Negative Arguments prove nothing. To ſay that Saint *Paul* planted the Goſpel in *Rome*, is giving the Lye to St. *Paul* himſelf; the very Firſt Chapter of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſhews manifeſtly your Authors Miſtake: The Holy Apoſtle writing to the Faithful in *Rome*, ſays *their Faith is ſpoken of throughout the whole World*, and adds, that he *oftentimes purpoſed to come unto them*; but, ſays he, *I was let hitherto.* Can any thing be more plain than this? What St. *Luke* ſays of the Matter is demonſtrative;

Iræn. ctra Her. lib. 3. cap. 1. *Tertul.* lib. 4 ad *Marc.* *Chryſ.* Hom. 2 in Ep. ad *Ro.* *Hier.* in cat. Scrip. Eccl. *Cypr.* Ep. 2 ad *Anto.* *Aug.* lib. 2 cont. Lit. Petil Sulp. lib. 2 Hiſt.

See Acts xxviii. 14, 15.

monſtrative; and I wonder your Author is not aſham'd to contradict ſo openly the Word of God, and impoſe ſo manifeſtly upon ignorant People.

Ibidem. 11. As to what follows, we own that the Gentiles were Saint *Paul*'s peculiar Charge, but ſtill with Subordination to the Supreme Paſtor. Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul* did inſtruct and convert both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and the Care of them was committed not only to them, but alſo to the other Apoſtles; but ſtill, as I ſaid before, with Subordination to the Supreme Paſtor, that Unity might be preſerv'd. 'Tis true, Saint *Peter* directed his Epiſtles to the *Jews*, but does that prove he never writ to the *Romans*? And ſuppoſe he did not, is no Man a Biſhop, who never wrote to the People of his Dioceſs? If others may be Biſhops, tho' they write nothing to their People, why ſhould *Peter* be depriv'd of his Biſhoprick upon that account? Beſides, is your Author ſure that Saint *Peter* never wrote to the *Romans*? Are all the Writings of all the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical Men ſtill extant? If ſo, then pray deſire your Author to ſhew you the Genuine Epiſtle of Saint *Paul* to the *Laodicians*: Let him produce the many Goſpels ſet forth, of which Saint *Luke* makes mention. When he has done that, he may have ſome Grounds to affirm that St. *Peter* never wrote to the *Gentiles*; but till he has, he muſt not think we are bound to believe him, in every thing he ſays, upon his bare Word.

12. We

12. We don't deny Saint *Paul*'s withstanding Saint *Peter* to the Face, before the whole Church of *Antioch*; and this shews his charitable Care of the *Gentiles*, as his charitable Correction of Saint *Peter* shews his Zeal for God's Glory, without lessening the Respect due to his Superior. To understand this, you must know there are Two Sorts of Corrections; One of Justice, belonging to Superiors; The other of Charity, belonging equally to all. Thus *Jethro* reprov'd *Moses*, *Joab David*, *John Baptist Herod*, and thus Saint *Paul* withstood Saint *Peter* to the Face, and none ever found fault with him for doing so but the Villain *Porphyrie*; he indeed taxes Saint *Paul* with Sawcinefs, for opposing his Superior; but this shews that St. *Peter*'s Supremacy was so notoriously known, that the Heathens themselves were convinc'd it was the common Belief of all *Christians*, tho' your Author and his Party be not now asham'd to deny it. Ibidem.

Further, Suppose your Father should induce your Children, or his own, by his wicked Example, to be guilty of great Crimes, would you think it amiss to give him a charitable Advice? If a Prince should destroy the Kingdom of *Christ* in his Dominions, must none represent him his Crime? I hope Passive Obedience does not reach so far! If a Bishop infects his Dioceſs with Heresy, must no Minister of the Dioceſs defend the Truth against him, or withstand him to his Face, in such Occasions? No, according to your Author, because (forsooth) *such a Behaviour in Inferiors*

riors would not be very suitable to Superiors. And is not this a Rare Doctrine!

Case stated, *page* 6. 13. As to what he adds, *That it had little become the Apostles to send their Sovereign upon Business, as they sent* Peter *to* Samaria, *if they had own'd him for such.* I ask your Author whether he thinks that all sending denotes Superiority in the Senders, and Subjection in the Sent? If so, then, 1. Saint Act xv. *Paul* and *Barnaby* were inferior to the Brethren at *Antioch*, who sent 'em to *Jerusalem.* If your Author owns this, I know where to have him. 2. In the Trinity the Son is Inferior to the Father, who sends him, and the *Holy Ghost* to the Son. This may not displease *Whiston.* 3. A King must not be sent to the Wars by the Advice and Consent of his Council, for fear he shou'd lose his Supremacy by it. And, Sir, since your Author, thinks it not becoming an Inferior to send his Superior about any thing, you have too much Manners to send him to me for my Conversion, as you have often threaten'd me you would; for, I suppose, he is your Superior in Spirituals; and it would *little become* you *to send* him *upon* any *Business* whatsoever, even for the Salvation of my Soul; tho' it was upon the like account that the Apostles sent St. *Peter* to *Samaria.*

Case stat. pag. 7. 14. Suppose what your Author affirms be true that some say *Peter was Bishop of the Jewish Converts at* Rome, *as St.* Paul *of the Gentiles*, what is that to the purpose, does that make St. *Paul* independent of Saint *Peter*

Peter? Yes, becauſe he would have had a much greater Flock than Saint *Peter*! Very well; and does the Greatneſs then of a Flock give a higher Juriſdiction? If it does, then the Biſhop of *London* is ſuperior to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. When this Prelate allows that, then you ſhall hear further from me; in the mean time, I muſt own your Author is skilful in Genealogical Hiſtory! That moſt of the Church of *Rome is now, and has been of the* Gentiles, is what I cannot deny, but that *all is now, and has long been ſo*, is more than I knew before. Your Author has a wonderful Talent at new Diſcoveries; but Sir, give me leave to make a few Objections againſt this: I think Saint *Luke* ſpeaks of ſome *Jews* converted by Saint *Paul* in *Rome*; and is your Author ſure that the Poſterity of thoſe *Jews* is quite extinct? Or can he give us ſome good Grounds for his Aſſurance? If he can, I will own my ſelf oblig'd to him, and will confirm what I have ſaid already, that he is very well skill'd in Genealogical Hiſtory. *Lu.* xxviii.

15. But now he is come to the Finiſhing Stroke, he is reſolv'd to ſhake the whole Frame of *Peter*'s Primacy, to the very Foundation; and a very fit Man he is to do the Buſineſs throughly! Dear Friend, tho' I am in a pretty good Humour, I cannot help being a little provok'd at your Author's unfair Dealing; conſider, I beſeech you, the Compariſon he makes, and obſerve how he applies it to Saint *Peter*. To *His 3d Section refuted.* Caſe ſtat. *page* 7.

make a right Comparison, he shou'd shew us a Scripturial Book with this Title, *The History of S.* Peter, *Supreme Pastor of all* Christians, as he can shew the History of *Charles*, King or Sovereign of all *England*, and the History of *Innocent* XI. Pope of *Rome*, *&c.* Indeed if he cou'd shew such a History, that neither calls Saint *Peter* Head of the Church, nor mentions any Act of his Spiritual Supremacy; as calling a Council, or presiding in it, *&c.* it would be a convincing Argument that he was not Supreme Head of the Church. But is the Acts of the Apostles such a History? Shameful! Sir, you know Saint *Luke*'s chief Design was to write the History of his Master Saint *Paul*, tho' he omits in it several Actions done by that Saint, and it contains but some few Actions done by Saint *Peter* and the other Apostles. However, it has enough in it to convince any Unprejudic'd Person of Saint *Peter*'s Primacy. For, 1. It gives him always the First Place. 2. He proposes first the Election of a New Apostle. 3. After the Descent of the *Holy Ghost* he first preaches to the *Jews*. 4. He works the First Miracle in confirmation of the Gospel. 5. He first preaches to the *Gentiles*. 6. He's the first to whom their Vocation was reveal'd. 7. He is the first that gives a Definitive Sentence in the Council of *Jerusalem*. This last your Author denies; he thinks what he says against us in this Point, a demonstrative Proof; and imagines we are *put to our Shifts to endeavour*,

deavour some Solution to it. But after all, what is this demonstrative Proof? Our goodly Author's own bare Affirmation; and a Gallant Demonstration that is!

16. 'Tis untrue that we can find no other Way to *get some Superiority to S.* Peter *in that Council*, than what your Author mentions; for we say he gave his Definitive Sentence first, as it plainly appears from the *Acts of the Apostles*; and this shews his Superiority over all the rest. That Saint *James, as President, gave his Definitive Sentence*, is most untrue, and grounded upon a False Translation in your Bible. I own he gave his Judgment or Opinion of the Matter: the *Greek* Word κεινω signifies as much; and when your Author can prove that it has no other Signification than what your Bible gives it, in the Place abovemention'd, you may be sure he shall have another Answer from me. Case, *p.* 8. Acts xv.

17. But, continues he, *if what is said of S.* James *had been said of* Saint *Peter, it would have been made use of as a full Proof of his Supremacy.* An Ingenious Conjecture! And pray, Sir, may not Words have a Different Signification, according to the Persons they are apply'd to! The Word *Power*, for Example, apply'd to the Queen, signifies a Supreme Power, but apply'd to a Judge or other Persons under her, it signifies a Deriv'd Power. The Word κεινω signifies *Jurisdiction*, or *giving Sentence*, when us'd by a Judge, but *Judgment*, or *Opinion* when us'd by a particular Person; and this perhaps, Ib. *page* 9.

haps might have been the Case of Saint *Peter* and *James*, in the Circumstances your Author mentions. A Strong Argument against Saint *Peter*'s Primacy!

Case, *p.* 9. 18. Now his poor Lord is in a great Concern, and your Author makes him look as silly as he can; but neither his Concern, nor the Author's Answer are worth minding. The Texts he mentions of Saint *Paul* are answer'd already, and what follows in this Page is nothing at all to the purpose: In the next he says, *If Saint* Peter's *Supremacy be so essential a Point, and upon which the Unity of the Church depends, it is inconceivable the Scriptures should be so wholly silent in it. Nay shewing the very contrary in Fact, as I have said already concerning Saint* Peter. He has indeed said it already, but has he prov'd it? I have prov'd the Scriptures *are not wholly silent in it, nor shew the contrary in Fact.* Others have done the same thing hundreds of times; Your Author knows it well enough, but his Simple Readers do not; and that's all he desires.

Case stated, *p.* 10.

Luk. xxii. 24. The Passage of Saint *Luke* concerning the Contest among the Apostles, is misunderstood by your Author. For 1. The Supremacy was not *then* settled upon Saint *Peter*, and 2. Their Dispute was who should be the greatest in their Master's Temporal Kingdom. This ambitious Error *Christ check'd*; but it was not the Time to determine the Spiritual Supremacy. This he did afterwards, for which we have both Scripture and Tradition.

Sir,

19. Sir, your Author makes a great pother with his Negative Arguments. *This is unconceivable*; *that is unconceivable*; *The Scriptures are silent in this*; *the Scriptures are silent in that*, is what we meet with almost in every Page of the Book; but I hope he has not so entirely the Property of this Way of arguing but that others may use it as well as he. Give me leave then, Sir, to use it against him thus. It is an essential Point upon which Faith and Salvation depend, to believe Scripture to be the Word of God, to believe such and such Books to be Scripture, *&c. Is it not then inconceivable that the Scriptures are wholly silent in this Matter? Is it not inconceivable* that the Apostles never settled the Canon of Scripture beyond Dispute? Either in a General Assembly, or in some Book universally receiv'd by all Primitive *Christians*, *&c.* What can your Author say to this? Let him make what Answer he pleases, it will justify or condemn both him and me. An Excellent Method of refuting our Principles!

22. Now we come to the Author's Third Section, and a Curious one it is, especially if we consider the Political Reflections it contains. Sir, has your Author been conversant of late with *H——dly*, *H—gdin* and *S—m*? *&c.* I thought he was no great Friend to those Gentlemen, and imagin'd he was for Kingly Government, according to the Constitution: But now I am afraid he has chang'd Principles; and if his System be true, there can be no Kingly Go-

Case stated, *p.* 11.

vernment upon Earth, unleſs it be in ſome Town or Village. Apply, Sir, the Objections he makes againſt an Univerſal Monarch, to our own Sovereign, and you will find 'em as concluding againſt the one, as againſt the other. For 1. Muſt not ours have under him a Number of Deputies, Governours, Officers, *&c.* 2. If his Subjects are reſolv'd to rebel, can his Prudence hinder their Defection? And this has been notoriouſly the Caſe of ſome of our Monarchs. 3. Has not this overthrown our Monarchy, and has not Kingly Government been quite aboliſh'd here? 4. Have not the Civil Wars ended here in the Sequeſtration, Devaſtation, Deſtruction, *&c.* of the Loyal Party? Therefore Monarchy is impoſſible: Therefore there muſt be no Monarchy in *England.* Grateful Concluſions to the *W—gs*, and for which they will thank your Author! What he ſays, That *God has conſulted beſt for the Peace and Safety of Mankind, in diſtributing the World into ſeveral Independant Governments*, is ſomething dubious, unleſs he can fix preciſely the Number of *Independant Governments* requiſite *for the Peace and Safety of Mankind.* When he does this, I ſhall think more upon the Matter; and I ſuppoſe ſuch a great Politician as he is, can eaſily do it!

Caſe ſtated, *page* 12.

21. Sir, there is no Government without ſome Inconveniency; but if the World were under One Monarch, I don't doubt but it would be as well or better governed than

than now it is. *Augustus* was Monarch of a great Part of the World, and in his time was not there a General Peace in his whole Empire? Since the Division of this Empire, can it be shewn that Peace has been so long and universal in the same Countries! Nay, is it not evident that in the same Countries, notwithstanding your Author's *Mediators*, *Guarantees*, *&c.* there has been, for these Two Hundred Years past, five times more Rebellions, Bloodshed, Devastations, *&c.* than there had been in 'em in the same space of Time, whilst they were under One Monarch? No Man that has the least tincture of History can deny this. What he adds concerning Unity in the World, is insignificant, and so I come to the Beginning of the Thirteenth Page: Here indeed he makes his Lord speak Truth, but I am sure the Author does not. *The Pope's Supremacy has* not *been the great Cause of Divisions*, &c. but the rebellious Disobedience of wicked Hereticks. King *Charles* the First's maintaining Monarchy was not the Cause of the Disorders which happen'd in the Kingdom, in his Life time, but the Hellish Disobedience of Republican Rebels. What *Gregory the Great* said of *John*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, we allow of; and no *Catholick* ever said that the Church depended upon One. (Here I must put your Author in mind that the Empire had been translated to *Constantinople*, long before *John* was born) We admit likewise of what St. *Cyprian* says of the College of Bishops, and

Case stated, *p.* 12.

Ib. *p.* 13.

that *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur:* But I hope your Author will not compel us to receive his Translation of this Passage; but if we should receive it, it makes more against him than against us, and 'tis but Passion alone against *Popery* that could hinder him to see it. You know, Sir, your Author exclaims most furiously against an Universal Bishop; and if this Translation be good, there is not one Bishop in the World but is so: *There is but One Episcopate*, says the Translation, *of which every Bishop has the whole, in Partnership with the rest.* Now Partners have equal Power with one another, over every part of the whole, which they possess in common: So every Bishop has as much Power, Jurisdiction, Right of Inspection, *&c.* in every other Diocess, as in his own, therefore in all the Dioceses in the World (Good News for Poor Bishops) there is an Universal Bp. and that too according to the Principles of the *Cyprianick* Age! A Goodly Frame indeed, and fit to support the Church of *Christ*! But not an Apostolical one, as I have shewn already. 2. Admitting his Translation, I answer directly, *There is but One Episcopate, of which every Bishop has the whole, in Partnership with the rest*; as it is a Holy Order, *I grant, but I deny that every Bp. has the whole* as to Jurisdiction, *in Partnership with the rest.* In your Opinion every Bp. in *E—d* has the whole Order of Episcopacy, as much at the Arbp. of *Cant.* but they have not the same Jurisdiction:

Jurisdiction. Theirs is over their respective Flocks, his is over the Bishops themselves: And thus it is with the Supreme Pastor. What harm then can this Passage do to his Supremacy? Sir, we admit of what Saint *Cyprian* says, *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*: And we can't conceive how this hurts the Pope's Supremacy. Because *there is One Episcopate, of which* each *Bishop* possesses wholly a Part, therefore there is no Supreme Pastor. A Goodly Consequence! *England is one* Kingdom, *of which* each Landed Man possesses wholly a part; therefore they do not hold of the Crown, nor is the King Supreme Lord! *W——ggs* may like this: *Germany* is an Empire, *of which* each Baron, Prince, Elector, *&c.* possesses wholly a part; therefore they don't hold from the Emperor, nor is he Supreme Lord and Governor of the whole! Are these Consequences to be admitted! Sir, we own that in the Church *there is but One Episcopate*, a part of it is committed to each Bishop *in solidum*, but still with Subordination to the Supreme Pastor. This was the Frame of the Church, not only in Saint *Cyprian*'s Days, but in all Ages from the Apostles time, down to ours; and will ever be so, notwithstanding all that rebellious Hereticks can either do or say to the contrary.

22. Now he comes again to his Political Reflections, and compares the spiritual Government of the Church with the temporal Case, *pag.* 14.

temporal Government of the World. But (Sir) do Princes in the World poſſeſs and govern the whole, *in Partnerſhip with* others? If ſo, then every Prince has a right in another's Dominions, and if one miſmanages or oppreſſes his People, *&c.* other Princes may call him to an account for it. Now, I thought Princes were accountable but to God alone; at leaſt I thought your Author believ'd that our Sovereigns had power to govern their Subjects as they pleas'd, without other Princes intermeddling in their Affairs; now it ſeems he is of another Mind, his Principles however may not be unacceptable to ſome, whilſt they may ſerve a Turn, eſpecially to thoſe *who delight in War*; and who knows but the Emperor, by virtue of his *Partnerſhip*, may look upon the Queen as guilty of Miſmanagement for making Peace, and ſaving her Subjects Blood and Treaſure, *&c.* But if he ſhou'd call her to an account for it, I hope your Author is ſo good a Patriot as not to ſide with him againſt her on ſuch an Occaſion.

23. After this he gives a goodly Notion of the Unity of the Church, and really it is Pity he was not nam'd one of the Comprehenſion Divines in K. *William*'s time.

Caſe ſtated, *p.* 14. *Its Unity*, ſays he, *conſiſts in the Common* Chriſtianity *wherein all agree*; ſo that if all Sects agree in ſome *Common* Principles of *Chriſtianity*, tho' they have no Ordination, Sacraments, *&c.* tho' they erect Altar againſt Altar, *&c.* tho' they curſe and damn

damn one another, &c. yet they are True Churches, and in Union with the *Catholick* Church. Silly Primitive *Christians*, that knew nothing of this Principle! It would have sav'd 'em the Labour of writing so many Volumes, preaching so many Sermons, assembling so many Councils, &c. and all to condemn the true Members of the *Cath.* Church, whom they unjustly call'd Hereticks. And is not this doing the Fathers and the Primitive Church a great deal of Honour!

24 What follows about *Obeying* Christ's *Commandments*, &c. is nothing to the purpose; and if it signifies any thing, it is against him and his Party, who have cut themselves off from us by a Causeless Separation: But one thing he says, which is a most Wicked Calumny: For when or where did the Church of *Rome* ever maintain what he calls her *Nostrum*, or say that Baptis'd Persons fallen from the Church, ceas'd to be *Christians*? This he can never shew; and until he does, you cannot find fault with me for believing he is not very sincere in his Dealings. Ibidem.

25. What he says of *Turks*, *Moors*, *Persians*, &c. is Mere Stuff; for what is it to us how those Infidels are govern'd? And we own that *'tis a Fancy never came into the Heads of no other Mortals but* Papists, *to extend the Supremacy of the Bishop of* Rome, *beyond the Limits of the* Roman *Empire.* Your Author here, against his Will, speaks Truth; for it came *into the Heads* of the Ancient Fathers, and every one knows they were Case, pag. 15.

thorow-pac'd

thorow pac'd *Papists*. I cou'd quote many of 'em upon this Matter, but for Brevity's sake I shall only mention Two of great Authority: Saint *Prosper* a notorious *Papist*, extends it far beyond the Limits of that Empire, and thus expresses the Sense of the Church of his Time:

S. *Prosp.* carm. de Ingratis.

* Rome, Peter's *Seat, which to the World is made the Head of Pastoral Honour. Whatever she does not possess by Arms, she possesses by Religion.*

S. *Leo*, another rank *Papist*, expresses himself in the same manner: (*a*) *You* &c. says he in an Apostrophe, to *Rome) that being made by the Holy Seat of* Peter, *the Head of the World, you might preside further by divine Religion than by Earthly Domination. For tho' by gaining many Victories, you have extended your Empire by Sea and Land, yet your Warlike Labour has less subdued, than* Christian *Peace has subjected to you.* The Translation is not polite

S. *Leo*, Ser. in Nat. App. *Pet. & Pa.*

---

* Sedes *Romæ Petri*, quæ Pastoralis Honoris Facta Caput Mundo, quicquid non possidet Armis Religione tenet.

(*a*) Isti sunt qui te ad hanc Gloriam provexerunt, ut Gens Sancta, Populus Electus Civitas Sacerdotalis, & Regia, per Sacram B. *Petri* Sedem, *Caput* Orbis effecta; *latius* præsideres Religione Divina quam Dominatione Terrena. Quamvis enim, multis aucta Victoriis, Jus Imperii tui Terra Mraiq; protuleris, *minus* tamen est quod tibi Bellicus Labor subdidit, quam quod Pax *Christiana* subjecit.

polite, but it is exact, and you can desire no more. But Sir, I had almost forgot to put you in mind, that this Saint *Prosper* was a peculiar Friend of Saint *Augustin*, and that this Saint *Leo* presided in a General Council admitted by your Party. This, Sir, is very observable, and I hope you'll take particular notice of it. Concil. Chalced.

26. But Sir, tho' the Pope's Supremacy is deny'd by all other Mortals but *Catholicks*, what is that to us? Do we believe or reject any thing, because it is believ'd or rejected by Hereticks or Infidels? If one should say, no Man but a *Christian* ever believ'd *J. C.* to be God, no Man but a *Protestant* ever believ'd *Protestancy* to be the True Religion, would these be good Arguments for denying *Christ*'s Divinity, or the Truth of *Protestancy*? I believe your Author will not allow this; and why then does he urge such Arguments against the Pope's Supremacy?

27. He says that *there is not one Word in Scripture appointing an Universal Head in the* Christian *Church*; and I say it is a False Assertion, and I have prov'd it such; and suppose there was not, it makes nothing against us, till your Author can prove that Scripture is the only Rule of Faith, and nothing to be believ'd but what is contain'd in it; which I am sure he, and all his Party together, can never do. Ib. *pa.* 15.

28. In the First Answer, *p.* 16. he seems to be mightily pleas'd with his own Acuteness, but I'll shew you he has no great Reason Case, *page* 16.

to

to be so. Sir, how often have we told your Party that our Dispute with 'em never regarded, in this Particular, the City of *Rome*, but the supreme Pastor residing there? How often have we said that before Saint *Peter* was at *Rome*, no other Church could be in subordination to the Church of *Rome?* But then we have told you as often that all Churches, even those that were *before* that of *Rome*, were afterwards subjected to her by St. *Peter*, when he fix'd his Seat in *Rome*. This your Author should have refuted with ~~something like~~ an Argument, and not have made use of a quibling Equivocation to deceive his simple Readers; But that was more than he was able to do, so he goes on, and uses still the same Equivocation against the Church of *Rome*. *After there was a Church at* Rome, says he, *the Bishops and Fathers of those Times, knew nothing of its Supremacy, far less of its Infallibility, nor ever appeal'd to it in their Disputes with Hereticks.* To this I answer, 1. Suppose *the Fathers knew nothing of* the *Infallibility* of the particular Church of *Rome*, or *of its* Pastor, what can your Author make of it? For this is no part of our Belief, and we may grant it without any Prejudice to the Faith of our Church. 2. That *the Fathers* knew *nothing of its* Pastor's *Supremacy* is manifestly untrue, as I have shewn you already. 3. It's likewise untrue that *the Fathers* never *appeal'd* even *to* that Pastor, *in their Disputes with Hereticks*; and if they had not, it's nothing at all against our Faith; but it is notorious

Case stated, *p.* 16.

notorious that they have *appeal'd* againſt *Hereticks* to the Church, aſſembled in General Councils, owning the Biſhop of *Rome* for their Head and Supreme Paſtor, and nothing but perverſe Obſtinacy can deny a thing ſo manifeſt. *Chal. C. Eph. &c.*

29. Some Churches *have contended for, and aſſerted their Liberties againſt the* particular Church and Court of *Rome*. This we own and commend 'em for it, but can your Author ſhew any Church that aſſerted an abſolute Independency upon the Church of *Rome*, and was not immediately condemn'd as Heretical or Schiſmatical? And now, Sir, I think when a Man ſo much inſults others, he ſhou'd remember his own Principles. Does not your Author ſay that *every* Biſhop *poſſeſſes the whole, in Partnerſhip with the reſt?* So *every* Partner having a right to *the whole*, it cannot be juſtly ſaid that any part is independent of him; therefore according to his Opinion, there is a mutual Dependance among all Biſhops; the Bp. of *Rome* depends on others, and others likewiſe depend on him, unleſs your Author thinks he is no Biſhop; but then what becomes of the Pretended Ordinations of your Party, which, againſt the Laws of the Land, they challenge, and derive from the Biſhop of *Rome*? This I cou'd demonſtratively prove, but I leave it to a Learned Friend, who in a ſhort time will publiſh an unanſwerable Diſſertation upon the Nullity of your Ordinations. *Ibidem.*

30.

Ibidem. 30. All that he says *of Unity, &c.* is insignificant, but what he adds is worth taking notice of. *All Churches*, says he, *agree in that Summary of our Faith call'd the Creed; and the Church of* Rome *her self must think this sufficient for Salvation.* If this be *sufficient*, then *Papists* are secure, for they admit the Summary; and it must be a most damnable Sin in those that separated from them, or remain in that Separation upon the account of Pretended Errors; for nothing but the Loss of their Salvation should have induc'd 'em to rebell against the Church of God, and cause so many Disorders, Massacres, Rebellions, *&c.* as they have done in all Nations wherever they have got any footing.

Case stated, page 17.

Secondly, It is disputable whether all those he calls Churches *agree in the Summary*; however, I'll let that pass, and I say that the Church of *Rome* does think the *Summary sufficient for Salvation* to those, to whom other Articles have not been sufficiently propos'd, but at the same time she thinks *the Summary* insufficient *for* the *Salvation* of those, who reject other Articles sufficiently propos'd to 'em, such as your Author and his Party are. I'll make this plain to you, Sir, by a Question or two, which I desire your Author to answer. Is *the Summary call'd the Creed sufficient for* the *Salvation of* a Man who positively rejects the whole Bible, looks upon it as a fictitious Book, and unworthy any Credit? Is it *sufficient for* the *Salvation of* a Man who rejects all Sacraments,

craments, *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper*, as abominable Superstitions? In a word, is it *sufficient for* the *Salvation of* a Man, who condemns as Articles of *Christianity* not contain'd in the *Summary?* What can your Author say to this? When he gives an Answer, I shall think him worthy of some further Consideration.

31. The Council of *Trent* has added no New Articles to the *Creed*; and we defy him and all his Party to prove that one New *Article* has been added to the *Old*: 'Tis true, the Council of *Trent* has explain'd and declar'd the *Old ones*, as the Councils of *Nice*, *Calcedon*, *Ephesus*, *&c.* had done long before; and where is the Fault of this? As to what he adds, that he *has met with no* Roman Catholick *so hardy as to say, that the Belief of* Purgatory, *the Invocation of Saints*, &c. *was necessary.* I answer, 1. *No* Catholick ever said *the Belief of* those things is *necessary* to Salvation, when not sufficiently propos'd: But 2. Every *Catholick* will tell him, that if those Points be sufficiently propos'd, and obstinately rejected, the Dis-belief of 'em is damnable Heresy. Case stat. pag. 17.

32. Now we come to his Fourth Section, and I must tell you plainly, that in his Second Answer he speaks neither like a Divine, nor like a *Christian.* How! *The Sacraments* no *Part of our Faith*? Are they not of Divine Institution? Are they not divinely reveal'd? Are they not contain'd in Scripture? Is not this sufficient to make 'em Objects of our Faith? And if it be not, *The Fourth Section answer'd.*

not, pray what is? Suppose *they* be *Signs and Seals of our Faith* in one Sense, does that hinder 'em from being Objects of our *Faith* in another? I thought hitherto that all *Christians* look'd upon Reveal'd things as Matters of Faith, but it seems your Author's *Private Judgment* has made a New Discovery in Divinity; but whether it be for the Good of *Christianity*, I'll leave you to judge.

Ca. *p.* 18. 33. What he adds in the following Page about the *Sacraments*, *&c.* is liable to many Exceptions; but since there's nothing material in it against us, I shall now proceed to his Fifth Section, wherein he says Two things which I wonder at. 1. He says that *we have more Sects among us than you have among you.* How can this agree with his own Principles? Does not he say that *we stand by our selves, that we are in communion with no Church, that we are irreconcileable*, &c. And does not he screw into his Church all manner of *Sects*, *Greeks*, *Cophtes*, *Ethiopeans*, *Nestorians*, *&c.* in a Word, all those that *believe the Summary?* How then is it possible that *we have more Sects among us than you have among you*! 2. He says, that his Church is no *more answerable for those that break off from her, than we are for those that break off from us.* How can that be? Does our Church admit of a Principle that is a necessary Cause of *Sects* and Divisions? No, we require Submission to Lawful Authority; if obstinate People refuse to submit, we cut them off from our Communion, but we are not answerable for their

their Disobedience. A Prince may require Submission from his Subjects, and if they disobey, is he answerable for their Crime? The Case of your Author's Church is quite different; she admits of a Principle which cannot but produce *Sects* and Divisions; she declares *that Private Judgment is the only Guide that must be follow'd*; now it's notorious that *Private Judgment is the only* Cause of *Sects*, Heresies, *&c.* in the World. Therefore your Church admitting it as a Principle, she is answerable for all the pernicious Effects it produces; she cannot blame Dissenters when they use it against her self; whatever they do or say, they may justify all by this Principle: You'll say they misuse it, they'll say the same thing of you; so there's no End: And yet after all this, *you are no more answerable for those Sects which break off from you, than we are for those that break off from us.* A Gallant Consequence!

34. Your Author begins his Sixth Section with a Stout Argument: The *Greek Church*, says he, *is elder than* yours, and therefore your *Church broke off from her.* Another Gallant Consequence! Suppose the *Greek Church be elder than ours*, what's that to the purpose? 'Tis not Age nor Priority of *Time*, but of *Jurisdiction*, that gives the Supremacy. I have told you this already, and really I am weary of repeating a thing so often. But Sir, is the *Greek Church elder* than Saint *Peter*, who fix'd his Seat at *Rome*, and by that means made her the Head of all Churches? Sure your Author will not say this. Other Churches in *Great Britain* *The 6th §. answer'd.*

are *elder than Canterbury*, yet *Canterbury* has the Primacy over 'em all; and if these Churches shou'd revolt from her, I believe she wou'd not be satisfy'd if they shou'd say, to justify themselves, that *they being the Elder Churches, she rather broke off from them by setting up her Primacy, than they from her*; or look upon it as a good Plea to maintain their Defection.

35. But is it not pleasant to see your Author affirm that *we broke off from the* Gr. *Church*. To hear him speak, one wou'd think he never had heard any thing of the infamous *Photius*. Sir, we can shew where, when, and how the *Gr. Church* departed from us; and this is an Advantage that our Ch. has over all Sects: We can tell the Place where, the Time when, the Manner how, and the Persons who first broached their Errors. This they can never do against us, and we defy 'em altogether to shew the least Innovation in any Point of our Doctrine, which they condemn as erroneous. Some of 'em have endeavour'd it, but you know with what Success! The desperate Shifts your Party are forc'd to in such Occasions, are evident Proofs that the Truth is invincible. The *French* Minister *D' Alix* has expos'd himself to the Laughter of all Learned Men, by an Attempt of this nature; and this shou'd deter ony other of his Coat, from medling any more with that Subject.

D' Alix Novelties of *Popery*, &c.

36. Your Author adds that the *Gr. Church never own'd our Supremacy*: But this is such a Mistake, that every Novice in Ecclesiastical

cal History may easily perceive it; and there's nothing more notorious than that the *Greek Church own'd the Supremacy of ours.* For 1. She allow'd the Bishop of *Rome* to preside in Councils made up of her Bishops: These Bishops call him their Head, and themselves his Members, *&c.* and testify all manner of Subjection to him; but which is more observable, they do this in Councils which the Author and his Party admit as orthodox; and to convince you the more of it, I quote you their very Words in their own Language. † 2. 'Tis notorious that she allow'd the Pope's Jurisdiction over her Patriarchs, Bishops, &c. and that he depos'd some, restored others, *&c.* 3. The many Appeals made to the *Pope* by *Patriarchs*, *Primates*, *Bishops*, *&c.* is a further Proof of the Pope's Supremacy being own'd in the *Greek Church*, and all this is asserted by the Authors and Members of that very Church. How then can you believe your Author when he asserts the contrary.

Soso. Hist. Ecc. Lib. iii. c. ii. *Theodoret.* Hist. Ecc. lib. ii. c. iv. Socr. H. Lib. ii. ca. v. &c.

37. Those whom he is pleas'd to call the *Numerous Churches of* Asia, and who in reality are but Condemn'd Hereticks, reject the Supremacy of the Church of *Rome*, and so do the Hereticks of *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Holland*, *&c.* and who denies this?

† Σὺ μὲν ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ἡγεμονεύεις, &c. PP. C. Cal. ad *Leo.* Τὰ ἅγια μέλη τῇ ἁγιᾷ κεφαλῇ. Con. *Eph.* Acts. 2. Ἡμᾶς ὡς οἰκεῖα μέλη προσκαλέσασθε. Patres C. *Constan.* apud *Theodoret.* Lib. v. Hist. cap. ix.

this? Hereticks will always reject the true Doctrine of the Church, we cannot help that; but their Perverseness does not deprive the Church of her Right: A Number of Rebels may reject a King's Lawful Title, but their Obstinacy does not make him forfeit his Right.

Ibidem. *Aug.* Ep. 162.

38. As to the Churches of *Africa*, read the 162 Epistle of Saint *Augustin*, and you'll be convinc'd of your Author's Mistake. The *Russians* were converted to *Christianity* by Schismaticks, since the time of *Photius*; they still persist in the same Schism, and so 'tis no Wonder they never own'd our Supremacy.

39. But, Sir, I wonder your Author does not remember what was decreed concerning the Pope's Supremacy, in a Coun-

Con. *Sard.* can. 3. 4. A.D. 345.

cil assembled in the Purer Times of the *Christian* Church, *viz.* about Twenty Years after that of *Nice*. The *Greeks* as well as the *Latins*, receiv'd it as œcumenial; and this Council allows Bishops, *&c.* to appeal to the Pope in case of Grievance, *&c.* and wou'd the *Grecks* have suffer'd this, if they *never had own'd the Pope's Supremacy?* Sir, 'tis too well known how jealous the *Greeks* have always been of their own Privileges.

Novell. *Theod.* Tit. 24. Circa A. D. 424.

But they believ'd the Pope to be Supreme, and so did *then* all Faithful *Christians* in the World, for the Reasons express'd in an Imperial Law publish'd in those Primitive Times, *viz.* That *the Supremacy of the See Apostolick has been establish'd both by the MERIT of Saint* Peter, *who is the Prince of Episcopal*

Episcopal Society, by the Dignity of the City, and by the sacred Authority of a Synod. That is by *Divine*, *Civil*, and *Ecclesiastical* Law. And can there be any thing more convincing than this is, for the Pope's Supremacy?

40. That *Rome stands by her self the most irreconcileably of any*, is very true; she never tampers with Hereticks, she'll not allow 'em to believe what they please, and yet admit 'em into her Communion. If they reject but one reveal'd Truth, she condemns 'em as if they rejected all; she considers the Supremacy of her Pastor as one of those reveal'd Truths, and if Hereticks should believe this, and deny any other Article, she would still condemn them: Your Church is not so; she can be reconcil'd with any thing, Hereticks, Schismaticks, *Cophtes*, *Nestorians*, *Abissins*, *&c.* any People are welcome so they believe the *Summary*. Tho' they curse, anathematize, damn, *&c.* one another, yet they are the same *Catholick* Church, because (forsooth) they agree in the Common Principles of Religion contain'd in the *Summary!* A Goodly Crew indeed, and fit to be call'd the Body of *Jesus Christ*! Case stat. p. 20.

41. Not only the greatest part, but the whole *Catholick* Church, did, and ever will own the Supremacy of the *Roman* Church; and whoever denies it is not of the *Catholick* Church, but a condemn'd Heretick. His Observation that *no Nation which broke off from* Rome, *ever return'd to her again*, is Ibidem.

most false; for not to mention others, the *Greeks* did return to her often, and broke off from her as often; nothing of an Historian can be ignorant of this; and if *Rome has been upon the losing hand* on one side, she has been upon the winning *hand* on the other; she has added to her Communion as many at least as fell from her; her Acquisitions in *Asia*, *Africa*, and especially in *America*, are visible; and if your Author be ignorant of this, he must be altogether unacquainted with what passes in the World.

Ibidem. 42. As to what he adds, we challenge him and all his Party, to shew the least *Change of Principles*, in *Supremacy* or *Infallibility*, relating to Faith: 'Tis but the Spirit of Error that makes him impose on us such a Calumny; and I'm sure he'll deceive his silly Lord, by promising what he will never be able to perform.

43. We own indeed your *Reformation* has done some good to the Church of *Rome*: It has made her Pastors and Doctors apply themselves with more Care than was before needful. Whilst ravenous Wolves are roving about the Flock, the Shepherd is more watchful. The Devil himself is beneficial to Good Men in the same manner; his Temptations make 'em more careful, and they acquire a greater Treasure of Merit by overcoming his Temptations. Thus your *Reformation* has *reform'd Popery*, and we thank you for it, as much as Good Men thank

thank the Devil, for tempting them to their Destruction.

43. Sir, what does your Author mean in saying *he knows nothing should hinder him to communicate with the* Greek *Church, if nothing sinful were requir'd of him as a Condition of Communion*; for he may say the same thing of the *Roman* Church. But does he think the *Greeks* require *nothing sinful as a Condition* of *Communion*? Let him consult his Brethren of *Wittemberg*, they'll tell him their Opinion of the Matter, and how kindly they were receiv'd by the *Gr.* Church in the Patriarch *Geremiah*'s time. If he means that the *Greeks require nothing sinful as a Condition of Communion*, then he thinks *Transubstantiation*, Adoration of the *Host*, Invocation of Saints, *&c.* not to be *sinful*; for they *require* a Belief of these *as a Condition of Communion:* And why then such a Hue and Cry after poor *Papists* for believing those Doctrines? Your Author will do well to give you some Satisfaction in this matter.

Case stat. page 20.

Resp. *Jer.* ad Theol. *Wirtem.*

44. 'Tis true, *Rome can Communicate with none but her self.* If by *Rome* your Author means that Church, spread in every Nation, and in Communion with the Supreme Pastor, commonly residing at *Rome*; and I have told you already that she rejects all Hereticks, Schismaticks, *&c.* We own that a Communion admitting Private Judgment as a Principle, is more *extended and extendable* than ours, for it takes in Schismaticks, Hereticks, Heathens, *Deists*, Atheists, *&c.*

Case stat. p. 31.

For

For they all follow this Principle, which according to your Author, *is the only Guide that God has given 'em.* Thus indeed you are more *Catholick* than we, and in that Senſe we will never diſpute with you the Title of the *Catholick* Church.

Ibidem. 46. What your Author adds is pretty odd: He ſays that *the Univerſal Supremacy is that which moſt of any one thing in the World, hinders the Union and Communion of* Chriſtian *Churches.* How can that be? For 1. He makes us to underſtand they are all in *Union* with one another, ſince they all agree in the common Principle of the *Summary*; and how can *the Supremacy* hinder *the Communion* of thoſe who are in *Communion* already? 2. If they be not, how does our *Supremacy* hinder the Author's Church to unite with ſome other Churches? Why does ſhe not try whether any other Churches in the World will admit her to their Communion, except perhaps the *Calvaniſts*, and 'tis no Honour for your Church to be admitted by ſuch a vile and infamous Sect as this is: Intereſt or Spite will make them do any thing; in 1632 they admitted of the *Lutherans*, but the *Lutherans* ſcornfully curs'd and rejected 'em. The *French Hugonots* hate Epiſcopal Ordinations, but in *England* they can conform. This ſhews what a Crew they are! Whilſt you are in Power they will fawn upon you, but you know how they us'd you in 1648, and how they uſe you now in *Scotland*; ſo there is no truſting to them.

But

But why does not your Church attempt an *Union* with the *Greeks*? It's true, they rejected the *Lutherans*, tho' nearer in Belief to them than you are: Perhaps they will not use you so uncivily, where's the harm to try? Why does she not make an *Union* with the *Lutherans*, who are nearer home? Tho' they rejected the *Calvinists*, they may be more civil to you, because you have settled a good Succession upon one of their Religion, and one Good Turn requires another. I say it again, where's the harm to try? But cursed *Popish Supremacy* is in the Way, and that spoils all! What a Disappointment! *Risum teneatis!*

47. The Author begins his Seventh Section with saying *there never was* a General *Council*, *&c.* and gives no Proof for it but his own Word, which is no Demonstration; but he gives the Lie to the Compilers of the 39 Articles, which shews no great Respect for such great Men! What he adds is partly untrue, and partly insignificant; its untrue that Councils call themselves *Oecumenical*, because they were within the Empire; had they been assembled without the Empire, as many have been since its Fall, they would have call'd *themselves Oecumenical*; whether the *Latin* Church was or was not *the Oikumene of the Empire*, it signifies nothing; and we own that Hereticks and Schismaticks have been partly the Occasion we are call'd *Roman Catholicks*; by that Name we are distinguish'd from Hereticks who

Case stat. p. 21.

The 7th §. refuted.

are

are in Rebellion againſt the ſupreme Paſtor reſiding at *Rome*. But *Du Pin*'s Remark, if it be his, is falſe; for long before the Schiſm of the *Greeks*, the True faithful were call'd *Romans*: But ſuppoſe the Obſervation to be true, what hurt can it do us? Or what Advantage can it be to your Author's Cauſe? Nothing, but to make ſimple Readers believe he ſays ſomething, when he ſays nothing at all.

Vide *Vit. Vticen.* Hiſt. de per vand. *Greg. Tur.* &c.

48. If *Du Pin* vindicates the Rights of every National Church, againſt the particular Church and Court of *Rome*, we commend him for it, and this I am ready to do when Occaſion offers; in the mean time I wonder your Author can have the aſſurance to quote falſely *the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, ſince every Reader of his own Book may eaſily diſcover the Impoſture. Pray, Sir, let us turn to Page 45 of the *Appendix*, let us compare his Quotations with the Places he quotes, and then frame what Judgment you pleaſe upon the whole. *The Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, ſays your Author, *tells the Pope that his Biſhoprick extends only to the Dioceſs of* Rome, *and his Patriarchate to thoſe Provinces call'd* Suburbicarian &c. The Words of the *Appendix* runs thus: *Is it that the Pope means to have no more Commerce with* France? *Is he perſuaded that his Power reaches no further than the Dioceſe of* Rome, *and his Patriarchſhip no further than the neighbouring Provinces call* Suburbicarial? *Does he intend to renounce the Quality of Head of the Church, and common Father*

Caſe, *pag.* 22.

Father of the Faithful? Now, Sir, has this Paſſage the Meaning your Author gives it? And is an Interrogation always the ſame thing with a poſitive Affirmation? If a Child ſhould ask a careleſs Father whether he thinks his *Power* extends not to the Children he neglects, or whether he intends *to renounce the Quality of Head of the* Family, or *Father of* his Childern *?* Wou'd this be poſitively affirming that the Father's Power does not extend to his Children? That he is no more *Head of the* Family, or *Father of* his Children? Ridiculous! Can this be Fair Dealing in your Author? Eſpecially ſince he knows the Parliament never intended to ſay any thing contrary to the four Propoſitions. Turn over to Page 51 of the *Appendix*, and there you'll find, to your Author's Shame, what their Opinion is; There they ſay, that *notwithſtanding all the Pope's ill Uſage to 'em, they will ever remain inſeparably united to the Holy See, will acknowledge S.* Peter's *Succeſſor as the Firſt and Chief of the Biſhops, will moſt religiouſly maintain the Communion and Correſpondence with the Church of* Rome. Can there be any thing plainer than this is? And what Opinion can you have of your Author's Sincerity?

49. What he ſays of the ſtout Reſiſtance of the Biſhops of *France*, is likewiſe untrue. Turn over to the 44th Page of the *Appendix*, there you'll find that thoſe Biſhops never pretended to Excommunicate the Pope, and that your Author muſt be either ignorant or malicious, when he gives

gives that Senſe to theſe Words, *Si excommunicaturus veniret, excommunicatus abiret.*

But what if ſome rebellious Biſhops ſhould have excommunicated the Pope and depos'd him too, could that prejudice his Right more than Rebellious Subjects could a King's; beſides if your Author be any thing vers'd in Antiquity, he'll find that in *France*, at that very time, the Pope's Supremacy was own'd by all the Kingdom. And then to what purpoſe his Quotations here.

50. Now your Author is in a Queſtioning Humour, and asks *what is that Head can be excommunicated by his Members*? If I ſhou'd retort *what is that Head can be* cut off and dethroned *by his Members*? And conclude from hence that King *Charles* I. *&c.* is not *Head* or Supreme, what would your Author anſwer? 2. He asks *what is that Supremacy can be limited or control'd by its Subjects, and of which they are Judges*? If your Author had read *Bellarmin*'s Book, which he quotes ſo often, he would not have propos'd ſuch a Queſtion. An Abſolute Unlimited *Supremacy* cannot *be control'd*, &c. *by its Subjects*, I own; but did we ever ſay there was ſuch a *Supremacy* in the Pope? Our Church Government is mixt, made up of Monarchy, Ariſtocracy, *&c.* Our Paſtor is ſupreme but not arbritrary; his Power is limited by the Laws of God and the Canons of the Church; Popes themſelves do own this: * And therefore his Subjects can know how far it reaches. Thus it is in *England*

Caſe, *pag.* 23.

Bell. de *Rom.* Pont. lib. i. cap. iii. &c.

England; the King's Power is limited: He must govern by Law, and not according to his Pleasure; yet none of you will deny that he is Supreme Governor both in Church and State. The Emperor is the Supreme Head of the Empire, yet his *Supremacy* is *limited and controul'd by his Subjects, and they are Judges of* it. The Government of the Church is much of the same nature with that of the Empire: This we assert, and why then all your Author's Impertinent Questions? Will he never leave off his Unfair Ways? Will he always impose Opinions upon us, and then refute them as if they were ours? This indeed is a very easy Way of disputing, but I hope you will not say, 'tis a very honest one. *Zozim*, apud *Grat.* 25. q. 1.

51. He begins his Eighth Section with an Assertion which has been already confuted, and upon his Lord's saying *that absolute Supremacy and Infallibility* are *not in the Pope, but in a General Council*; he cries out *this gives up* your *whole Foundation.* Pray, Sir, what *Foundation* does it give *up*? For suppose *Popes and not Councils, pretend to be Successors of Saint* Peter, *and Heirs of all the Promises made to him*, how does that hurt the Church's *Infallibility*, or the Pope's Limitted *Supremacy*? Know this from your Author Case stat. *pag.* 23. *The 8th Section refuted.*

* *Mart.* 1. Ep. 9. *Canones Ecclesiasticos* (inquit) *solvere non* possumus *qui Defensores & Custodes Canonum sumus non Trangressores.*

Author the first time you see him, and in the mean time let us examine his learned Thought upon the Councils.

52. Sir, I have often wonder'd at the Injustice of your Party; they accuse us of propagating *Deism* in the Nation, and say 'tis *undoubted Fact*, when they themselves are guilty of this Crime. To maintain their Rebellion against us; they frame certain Principles, which the *Deists* turn against 'em with Advantage: When we represent to 'em the dangerous Consequences of these Principles, they exclaim most bitterly against us. We cannot help that; whatever they say we must defend the Truth; but it is a peculiar Providence of God, that our Enemies can say nothing against us, but what at the same time destroys all Religion; and this is worth the particular Notice and serious Consideration of any Man who thinks he has a Soul to be sav'd,

See Phil. Lipsi. *Answer to the* Free thinker.

53. What your Author objects against *Councils*, to make 'em of no Authority, is of this kind. A *Deist* can make the very same Objections against the *Scripture*, to shew that it can be no Rule of Faith. He can say, *You* Christians, *you are not agreed among your selves concerning* Scriptures, a great Number of your Ancient Fathers *give Lists of many Books call'd* Scripture, *which are to be rejected, they give Lists of other Books that are to be partly receiv'd and partly reprobated; they mention other Books as doubtful*

Case stated, *page* 23.

doubtful, that is, neither approv'd nor rejected; this is going thro' all Degrees of Uncertainty: And some of them say that several things in those Books allow'd to be Scripture, *were foisted in by Hereticks. The Church of* England *receives the Books contain'd in the* New Testament, *wholly and throughout, but the Church of* Sweden, Denmark, *and other* Lutheran *Churches, reject a great part of them; so that who place the Infallibility in* Scripture, *will need another Infallible Judge to determine these Disputes concerning the* Scriptures, *which are truly canonical, and which are not; and which are partly so, and which throughout; and what part of those that are throughout, has been corrupted by Hereticks; if that may be call'd true throughout, which is corrupted in any Part; and when one* Scripture *condemns another, by contradicting it, which shall we believe? And if we must not believe every* Book *that assumes the Title of* Scripture, *we can believe no other Book contradicting it, for that same Reason. The* Book *of* Revelations *is generally condemn'd by the* Lutherans, *yet it calls it self* Scripture, *and is so as, much as any other* Book; *and what a thing is it to say the* Scriptures *so call'd, are partly right and partly wrong? And who is Judge of that? Is there any Certainty in this, much less Infallibility? And we must have an Infallible Method too, to preserve those* Scriptures *that they be not adulterated, as* great Numbers of you *say they have been, and they continue so to this Day in the Volumes of their* Bibles: *Why then are they not amended, and these Suppositions and adulterated Parts (these*

are the Words of many Learned Christians*) struck out? But the several Editions of their* Scriptures *are in the Hands of other People, and therefore they can make no Alteration in 'em without being detected.* Now, Sir, let your Author answer the *Deists* Objections, and if his Answer be good in defence of *Scripture*, I'll engage to apply it to solve what he objects against *Councils.*

54. But further, if his Objections be good against General Councils, and if they are impossible, as your Author boldly affirms they are; there never was, nor ever will be, a Lawful Parliament in *England*; for there is not one Objection that can be made against the Possibility of Councils, but may be us'd against the Possibility of Parliaments, and then what becomes of Liberty and Property? A Disperate Shift! But thus it is with your Party; they cannot attack us, or maintain their Heresy, but they must admit Principles destructive either of *Christianity* or Government. *Durum Telum Necessitas!*

Let us put this in a clearer light. You know, Sir, a Parliament is the whole Nation assembled in its Representatives, when it is lawfully call'd, and every Member admitted to Vote freely, then it's look'd upon by all, as a Lawful and General Assembly of the whole Nation. Now if some of the Members should be detain'd by Sickness, Business, Captivity, Neglect, *&c.* would their Absence hinder this Assembly from being a Lawful Parliament? No Man in his

his Wits can say this. Besides, have we not Rules to know when a Parliament is lawful, and when not; when 'tis to be wholly rejected, and when partly? Don't we know that *Oliver*'s are wholly to be rejected; *Charles* the First's to be partly receiv'd and partly rejected; the first whilst they remain'd in due Subordination, the second when they degenerated into a Rebellious Conventicle? *&c.* Thus it is in Councils; The Supreme Pastor calls 'em by a Lawful Authority, every one that has a right, is admitted, and gives freely his Opinion of Matters, *&c.* Some cannot come for several Reasons; but this does not hinder the Council from being a General Assembly of the Church, no more than it does a Parliament from being a General Assembly of the Nation. Besides we have our certain Rules, to know when a Council is lawful, and when not, what Councils are partly so, and what not; and what part is corrupted and what not; we have likewise means to know when one Council condemns another, which to believe and which not. And whenever he has a mind to learn, he shall be fully instructed in this Matter.

55. Now let us make some few observations upon what he has here objected against *Councils.* 1. *Bellermin* does not allow that any thing essential to Faith was *foisted* into *Councils by Hereticks*, and the Foisting in of other things has happen'd to *Scripture*; so that can be no Argument against *Councils.* 2. *The Council of* Lateran does not condemn

the Council of Basil, whilst it remain'd *a True Council*; but when it turn'd into a Disorderly *Conventicle*; as a *True* Parliament condemn'd the *Rump* Parliament, which was a Lawful one in the Beginning, but afterwards degenerated into a Rebellious *Conventicle*. 3. *The Church of* France does not receive *the Council of* Basil *wholly*; and 'tis easy to know this by reading any Author that speaks of the Matter.

56. Now your Author is willing to make a Scheme for us; and a Good one it must be, since it comes from the Hands of such an Officious Friend! But I hope I may have leave to make some few Exceptions against it. 1. He says *the Church of* Rome *makes her self the Universal or* Catholick *Church*; if he means by *the Church of* Rome all *Christians* professing the True Faith, and in communion with Saint *Peter*'s Successor, he is mistaken; *she* does not *make her self the* Catholick *Church*, for *she* was *made* so by *Jesus Christ*, before any *Christians* were in *Rome*. 2. This *Church* owns, that *whoever is not in her Communion, is out of the Pale of the* Catholick *Church*. 3. And thus the True *Church*, tho' never so little a Flock, exclusive of all *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Heretricks*, *Schismaticks*, *&c*, *is the whole* Catholick *Church*, as it was in the Apostle's time. 4. And thus what your Author calls *a small part*, is in reality *the whole* Latin and *Catholick Church*, *exclusive of the* Greek, Lutheran, &c. and *those Councils*

Councils which Hereticks call *Party Ones*, are *universal* and *infallible*. Your Author laughs at this; but laughing is no proving, and so, much good may it do him. 5. He has not shewn that *the Church of* Rome *has no right to the Title* of the *Latin or Universal Church*, for she is the only True *Church* in the *Latin* World, and *the* only True *Church* in the *whole* World: We don't deny but she may be outnumber'd by Hereticks, Schismaticks, *&c.* in some Parts of the World, but that does not hinder her from being the Only True *Universal Church*, as she was when the *Arians* were so numerous, *&c.* 6. 'Tis untrue that *the Church of* Rome has *no National Church in her Communion, but in* Europe, for she *has in her Communion* the *National* Churches *of Mexico, Peru, &c.* But perhaps he think 'em no Nations, because the King is not their Countryman. A Curious Thought!

57. That *some of* our *Communion are in most Countries*, is true, and more then your Author can say of his. When shall you see any of his Coat expose their Lives to preach *Jesus Christ* to Infidels? Catch 'em at that if you can: They love to sleep in a whole Skin; and their only Aim is to reform *Christians*, not to convert Heathens to the Faith! It is untrue that *the* Jews *are more universal than* our *Church*; and if they were, it is insignificant. That *the Seminaries of* Rome, or Converted *Catholicks* in Heretital Nations, *cannot represent* those Heretical *Churches*, we own, nor Two or Three (if

They be so many) nor 500 *Popish* Bishops, can represent what he calls the *Church of England*; but those *Semenaries and Bishops* may *represent* the true Faithful in each Heretical Nation; for *they* who make profession of the True Faith, are the *Church* of the Nation; and tho' Heresy should be establish'd by Law, yet that does not make it a True Church; I'll make you sensible of what I say, by some few Examples, which I believe your Author himself cannot except against. 1. When *Catholicks* were under the *Arian* Emperors, and when the *Arians* were then what your Author calls *the National Church*; could no Council be assembled, because the *Catholicks* could *not represent the* Arian *Church?* 2. Did the *Catholick* Bishops of *Spain*, under the *Arian Goths*, do amiss in assembling Councils, and making themselves Representatives of the *Church of* Spain? *&c.* 3. When *Popery* was establish'd by Law, in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, was there no *National Protestant Church* remaining, or could none of their Pastors *represent* the *Protestant Church* of *England?* 4. Could not Four or Five Nonjuring Bishops in King *William*'s time, *represent the Church of* England? Yet I think your Author was of this Opinion, and is so still, unless his Friend *Dodwell*'s Book has made him change Principles. And what he repeates here of *St. Peter* and St. *Paul* has been refuted already, and I think to your Satisfaction.

Dod. *Case in view, now in fact* Case, *page* 26.

The 9th answer'd.

§ 58. Now your Author comes to the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and thinks what he says

says against it is unanswerable: But you shall soon find how much he is mistaken.

'Tis true, if bold Affirmations without Truth will do the business, our Case is desperate; for no Man is better at this than your Author is. You see, Sir, what he says, that *Infallibility is no where, nor can be among Men.* How! 1. Cannot God, with all His Power, preserve Men from Error and Sin! 2. If He cannot, what do so many Great Men of your *Church*, mean when they say the *Church* is *Infallible* in *Fundamentals*, and by that Answer endeavour to get rid of our Objections. 3. I think Senses are among Men, and how often have you told us that they are *infallible* about their proper *Objects* in proper *Circumstances*; and is not this one of your *Reasons* against *Transubstantiation*. 4. I thought your Philosophers admitted an *Infallible* Knowledge of First Principles; as, *The whole is greater than a part, Nothing can be and not be at the same time*, &c. *but now it seems no such thing can be among Men.* A Curious Opinion! Ibidem. Laud, Chilling, &c.

59. Your Author quotes several Passages to maintain this Opinion, and to shew the *Jewish Church* was not *Infallible*, but his Quotations are to no purpose; for not one of them proves that the *Jewish Church* err'd in her *Doctrine*: The *Jews* liv'd wickedly, and *this* they were blam'd for, but not for proposing *False* Doctrines. The Passage of *Isaiah* is not said of the *Jews* as a *Church*, but as a *Nation*, and the Case flat. *pag.* 27. Is. i. 5. 6.

Words following manifestly shew it; and suppose it be said of the *Jews* as a *Church*, it is in relation to her *Manners*, and not to her *Faith*. The Passage of *Jeremiah* has the same meaning; and so your Author has grosly misapply'd 'em both,

Jer. xii. 8, 9.

Is. lix. 20.

69. 'Tis most untrue that the Promises he mentions were made to the *Jewish* Church, or belong literally to her; the preceding Verse shews *the Promises* were made to the *Church* of *Christ*. The Argument of the Chapter in your own Bible is plain for it, and I think the Authors of those Arguments have as much Authority in your Church as your Author has. Here he returns again to his old Fallacy of confounding the particular Church of *Rome* with the *Catholick* Church in Communion with the Bishop of *Rome*; and 'tis untrue that this Church so consider'd, has *no other pretence to the Promises*, than that *of the Supremacy of the particular Church of Rome*; for she being the only True Church, has *all Pretences to all the Promises made to the Church in general*: Therefore the Supremacy cannot be *her only Pretence*. As to what he adds, we know that the Church of *Rome*'s Supremacy is disputed by Heretical Sects, which the Author call *Churches*, and so is very often, a King's by Rebels; but that does not deprive of their Right neither the one or the other. The *Jewish* Church was not the *Only Visible Church of God*, for *many* were sav'd out of *her*, and none *Jews* but were

Case stat. *pag.* 28.

bound

bound to be of *her*: No Divine can be ignorant of this.

61. Now upon the Lord's asking whether the *Promises of God can fail*, your Author's *Answer* seems to contradict what he has said of it in another place: He there affirms *there can be no such thing as Infallibility among Men*, and now he seems to allow of a *Conditional* one; for he grants that God's *Promises can never fail*, if the *Condition imply'd be observ'd*; now it depended on the *Jews* to fulfill the *Condition* requir'd, and if they had, their *infallibility* had been *unalterable* and *indefeasible*. So here we have some *Infallibility* at least *among Men*. His Assertion that there is still a *Condition imply'd in* God's *Promises*, is false; for the *Promise* of the *Messiah* and several others, were unconditional and independent of our Obedience. The Passages he quotes are nothing to his purpose, for there is no Mention made in 'em, that the *Jewish Church* should *fail* in Matter of *Doctrine*. In the Passage of *Jeremiah* the Word (*Church*) is most unfairly foisted in by your Author, and against the Prophet's Meaning; for *God may pluck up, pull down, and destroy a Nation*, &c. as He did the *Jews*, by reducing them to Slavery, *&c.* And yet the *Church* may be safe, unless your Author thinks that a *Persecuted Enslav'd* People cannot be of the Church, and profess the True Faith!

Ibidem.

Vide *Case*, *p.* 26. (9.)

Jer. xviii. 7, &c.

Case stat. *page* 29.

62. What follows in your Author is worth Observation. For, 1. He says *that God has told us plainly that we are to understand*

Ca. p. 29. *ſtand His Promiſes conditionally.* 2. That *this was the Language of the Prophets to the* Jewiſh *Church.* 3. That *ſhe underſtood it not, but lent upon the Promiſes made to her as unconditional.* 4. That *this harden'd her againſt the Prophets, as Enemies to the Church.* Now how could the *Jewiſh Church* perſecute *Jeremy* (for Example) *as* an Enemy *to the Church*, if ſhe did *not* underſtand his *Language*? And how was it poſſible that *ſhe* did *not* underſtand his *Language*, which is *ſo plain* and eaſy, that your Author underſtands *it*? Beſides, if the *Jewiſh Church* perſecuted the Prophet *Jeremy*, for *telling her the Promiſes made to her were conditional*, why did *ſhe* receive that Prophet's Book, containing thoſe Words, as divinely reveal'd, and propoſe it as ſuch to her People? And was not this manifeſtly deciding that *the Promiſes made to her were conditional*, and her *Infallibility* only temporal? But *I* ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more of the matter, in the mean time, I ſhould be glad to know if your Author could anſwer this.

Caſe ſtat. p. 30. 63. Here your Author quotes a Paſſage out of the *Romans* againſt the *Church* of the *Gentiles*, but it makes nothing againſt us: For 1. It's ſaid of a *particular Church*, as your Author owns, and we never deny'd but a *Particular Church* might err from the Faith; nay if all the *Gentiles* ſhould fall from the Faith, and *the Jews be graffed in* again, that does not prove the *Fallibility* of the *Church*. *Promiſes* may be *conditional* to *Particular Churches*, and upon *Non-performance* they may

Rom. xi. 22, 23.

may be rejected; this we know by Sad Experience: The Fall of *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Greece*, *&c.* are lamentable Proofs that if a People do *not continue in the Goodneſs of God*, and live up to the Holy Religion they profeſs, God forſakes 'em, delivers 'em over to their own Deluſions, and *takes from 'em His Kingdom, and gives it to Nations bringing fourth it Fruits*; but what's all this againſt the *Catholick* Church of *Chriſt*? If one Member falls off, another is added; the *Jews* were rejected, the *Gentiles* were receiv'd; and if the *Gentiles* ſhould not *continue in the Goodneſs of God*, He would *graff in the* Jews *again*. And I repeat it again, what can the Author make of all this againſt us?

64. The Paſſage of St. *Luke*, which your Author applies to the Church in general, has not the Meaning he gives it: *Jeſus Chriſt* ſpeaks there of a *Perfect* Faith, which even *now* is found in very few: Thus 'tis underſtood by the Holy Fathers of the Primitive Church; and if it were to be underſtood of total Defection, then *Jeſus Chriſt* would contradict Himſelf, for he aſſures that the *Elect will not be ſeduc'd*, and the Miſeries they are to ſuffer by the Fury of *Antichriſt*, will make 'em *viſible*, for I ſuppoſe your Author does not think Inviſible Men may be perſecuted by this Man of Sin! What follows ſignifies nothing, and is anſwer'd in every little Catechiſm; the Paſſages are obſcure, and ſo can prove nothing, however I'll anſwer 'em for your ſatisfaction.

Lu. xviii. 8.

Aug. Ser. 26 de ver. Dom. Beda, in Commen. &c.

He

Case stat. p. 31. Rev. xii. 6. &c. He says *the Church is compar'd to a Woman perſecuted into a Wilderneſs*; but then ſhe was ſo *viſible* that the *Dragon followed her*: It is *compar'd to a Lodge in a Garden of Cucumbers*; and is there any thing more *viſible* than *a Lodge in ſuch a Garden*? It is *compar'd to a Beſieg'd City*; and is there any thing more *viſible*? Let him conſult the poor *Germans* in *Friburg*, and they will tell him their Opinion upon this matter. But perhaps your Author thinks that Men can bombard Inviſible Houſes, batter Inviſible Walls, mount Inviſible Breaches, *&c.* I knew your Author was a Politician, but I did not think he had ſo much Skill in Military Affairs as this come to! Sir, excuſe my Ignorance!

Ibidem. 65. His Explication of the Paſſage out of the *Epheſ.* may be eaſily excepted againſt, but as it ſignifies but little, I ſha'n't inſiſt upon it. *The Church of* Rome *labours under no Difficulties, nor applies to her ſelf what is apply'd to the Church in her Triumphant State*: She knows that many of her Members are very corrupt in their Manners, and ſhe deplores their Diſorders, but at the ſame time ſhe knows that her Faith is pure and ſpotleſs, and ſhe defies all her Enemies together to prove the contrary. 'Tis true, our Pious and Learned Men *do lament the Corruptions* of Manners in our *Church*, and labour by *preaching*, Good *Example*, *writing*, *&c.* to mend thoſe *Corruptions*. They know thoſe *Corruptions* have been the Cauſe of your *Reformation*, 'twas her *Currupt*

rupt and wicked Members that gave a Beginning to it; if their Lives had been holy, they had remain'd in the Church of *Christ*; but Lewd, Ambitious, Irreligious Priests, Princes, and People, *went out from us, because they were not of us:* But this we have got by it, that they carry'd away with 'em *most* of our *Corruptions*; and Oh! That it pleas'd God they had *all* the rest among 'em. John, *Ep.*

66. Here your Author repeats again his old Maxim, that *Nothing can be infallible but what is impeccable*: If so, then no Man knows that *Two* and *Two* make *Four*; that if he *thinks*, he does *exist*; that a *part* is less than the *whole*, *&c.* I believe your Author's Senses are not *impeccable*, why then does he think 'em *infallible* about *Transubstantiation*, *&c.* But I have spoke of this already, and so shall say nothing more on't here. Case, *pag.* 32.

67. Your Author begins his Tenth Sect. with saying the Apostles were neither *infallible nor impeccable.* This shews great Respect for the Companions of our Saviour *Jesus Christ!* But what Proof does he bring against 'em? *Saint* Peter *walk'd not uprightly*, &c. This indeed may prove that he was not *impeccable* in his Actions, but how does that prove that he was not *infallible* in Matters of *Faith*? All the other Passages out of Saint *Paul* signify nothing, for what *Catholick* ever said that the Apostles *were*, or the Church *is infallible in every thing*? What we say, is that the Apostles *were*, and *The Tenth Section answer'd.* Gal. ii. 13, 14. 1 Cor. vii. 6. x. 12. &c.

and the Church *is infallible* in delivering to us the *Reveal'd* Doctrines of *Christ*; but in other things we own the Church *may be*, and *has been* miſtaken. Your Author, if we believe him, has read *Bellarmin* and others of our Communion, he has ſeen this affirm'd and prov'd in every one of them, and why then does he object all this againſt us?

68. Now your Author comes to the Miracles of the Church of *Rome*, and denies 'em ſtoutly. We don't wonder at that; the *Jews* deny'd thoſe of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and why ſhould not we be ſatisfy'd with the ſame Uſage our Maſter had? I own, ſome Wicked Members of the Church of *Rome* have *forged falſe Miracles, which have been notoriouſly detected*; but did any of *yours* ever detect 'em? This, Sir, your Author cannot ſay; the Church of *Rome* is ſo cautious in this Matter, makes ſuch ſtrict Examinations, pronounces ſo many Anathema's againſt ſuch Forgeries, that 'tis no eaſy thing to deceive her. She is the firſt to *detect* 'em, to expoſe their Authors, and puniſh 'em ſeverely. Of this many Inſtances may be given; but at the ſame time ſhe knows the Hand of the *Lord* is not *ſhorten'd*, He has now the ſame Power he had in the Apoſtles time; He has promis'd that thoſe who believe in Him, ſhould do what He had done, and greater things; and ſhe thinks that ſometimes He gives ſuch a Power to his Servants. If they do any Action like a Miracle, ſhe makes a rigorous examination

The 11*th* §. *refuted.*

Caſe ſtat. *p.* 33.

examination of the Matter, and when by Indisputable Testimonies she finds the thing to be true, she approves on't, and believes it with the same Certainty, as she does other Facts depending upon the *mere Testimony* of Man; but those Miracles are no *part* of her *Faith*, neither does she propose 'em as *such*; her Childeren may believe 'em or disbelieve 'em, as they see *cause*: And can the Church's Conduct be blam'd in this?

69. But says your Author, *One False Miracle is enough to disprove all coming from the same Hand.* Very well, Sir: But can your Author prove that the Church of *Rome* admits of any *False* Miracles? Or can he shew that she ever propos'd any Legendary Miracle, to be believ'd as a Matter of Faith? Unless he can shew this, what he says proves nothing against the Miracles of the *Rom.* Church. 2. *If one False Miracle is enough to disprove all coming from the same Hand*, then *one False* Doctrine *is enough to disprove all* Doctrines *coming from the same Hand.* But you believe that the Church *may* and *has* taught Erroneous Doctrines, *therefore*, according to your Author, that's *enough to disprove all Doctrines coming from* her; Therefore she must not be believ'd when she teaches that *Scripture* is the Word of *God*, &c. Your Author will not deny but sometimes he has told some Untruths, and this very Book which we read, is a plain Proof that he has told many; why then shou'd not *one* Untruth be *enough to* Ibidem.

disprove

disprove all that he has ever said against us? I hope, Sir, you'll believe his Maxim against himself in this, and according to *it* believe nothing that is contain'd in his Book against *Popery*. The *Legends*, as I said before, are not believ'd upon *the Authority* of the Church, and if all Books must be rejected because of some Mistakes, Fictions, and
Ca. *p.* 34. Errors, *&c.* then your Author and others too, are in a sorry Condition. There are some Foolish things in some *Legends* I own, and the Members of the *Roman* Church exclaim against, and redicule 'em too, as much as any other can; but that *our learned Men call 'em Pious Cheats*: As if *Cheats* were allowable to *stir up the Devotion of the People*, is a hellish Calumny: And what he says of the *Virgin*'s Milk, of the *Cross*, *&c.* we explode and laugh at as much as he, unless we have Solid Reasons to believe what is said of 'em.

Ibidem. 70 Your Author laughs on still and asks, *Is it the Head or Body of the same St. that is shewn in Different Churches*? I answer seriously *No*. But a Mistake may happen concerning *Saints* of the same Name, and one may be taken for the other. Thus it is in Two Cities in *France*; *Amiens*, and *St. Jean D' Angeli*; they both pretend they have St. *John Baptist*'s Head, but the Truth is, they both have Heads of Saints call'd *John*, so they are not mistaken in the thing; for both have Heads of *Saints*, but they give 'em the same Name; and where's the Absurdity in this? Besides, neither of *the Churches*

Churches will say they have Miracles to prove they have the true Head of Saint *John Baptist*, if they produce any Miracles, 'tis only to *vouch* they have the True Relick of a *Saint*, whatever his Name be: But as I said before, this is no Matter of *Faith*, and every one has free liberty to think of it what he pleases; besides, we know there may be Abuses among us, which the Church condemns, and uses all Means possible to reform 'em; and can your Author find any Society of Men, who have no Abuses among 'em? As for the Book he refers us to, intitled *The Devotions of the Church of* Rome, 'tis an infamous *Collection* of scandalous Lies and monstrous Mis-representations, *compiled* by the Ignorance and Malice of some Man void of Honour and Conscience: A very *fit* Book to serve your Author's turn! What he adds is a notorious *Calumny*, for *Relicks* are neither *bought nor sold* among us, we look upon such a Practice as *sacrilegious*, our Divines are unanimously of this Opinion; and so *that* can *be no prejudice to Men of Sense against our Religion.*

Con. *Trid.* de refor. &c.

71. What your Author says, that *our Common People put the Legends upon the level with the Holy Scriptures, as having the same Foundation*, is *another* notorious *Calumny*. Our Church proposes to her *common People* the *Scriptures* as divinely reveal'd, and incapable of Error, she proposes the *Legends* as humane History, capable of Corruptions and Mistakes; she binds 'em to believe *Scripture* as an *Article* of Faith, but leaves

Cas. p. 35.

the Belief of the *Legends* to their own *Discretion*; and we challenge your Author to shew any of our *common People that put Legends upon the same level with the Scriptures*, &c. Sir, you know many of our *Common* Sort; have your ever found any of 'em guilty of what you Author lays to their charge? 'Tis true, we cannot instruct 'em as much as we wou'd, and you know very well the Reasons why we cannot; but still they are not such Brutes as your Author makes 'em, they know at least the First Principles of *Christianity*, especially that they are bound to pray for *their Persecutors* and *Calumniators*; and so your Author may expect they'll pray most heartily for him.

Ibidem. 72. As to what your Author adds, we *give no handle to Atheists or* Deists, *to render Scripture fabulous*; but he and his *Confreres* are guilty of this Crime, they furnish 'em with Principles to attack all Reveal'd Religion, and those Principles have been us'd in the Discourse upon *Free-thinking*, a Book which none of you cou'd ever answer to any Satisfaction; *Phil. Lipsius* has done something towards it, by the help of a certain *Popish* Principle, call'd *acquiescing or submitting to the Judgment of others*, &c. tho' at the same time he rails against the poor *Papists*: And thus he thanks us for borrowing our Principles! But then he lays himself entirely open to the *Free-thinker*, who perhaps will not neglect such a visible Advantage. But as I shall I have occasion

Phil. Lips. *against Dis. on* Free-thin. &c. Par. I.

occasion to shew this more at large, I shall say nothing more on't now.

73. As we are not Conjurers enough to bring our selves out of the *old Circle*, your Author offers his Service to do the Business. We don't doubt of his being more skill'd in the Black Art than we can be; but we are not very willing to deale with Men of his Profession; besides he need not give himself the trouble of casting a Figure to bring us out of a *Circle* in which we never were, and too, I can hardly believe his Skill tho' never so great, can reach so far! Sir, a *Circle* is when one thing is prov'd by another and so back again to a Man who admits *neither*, but if the same Man admits *either*, then 'tis no *Circle* but a solid Proof: For Example, your Party reject the Infallibity of the Church, they admit Scripture; now to prove out of this Scripture, which they admit, the Infallibilty of the Church which *they* reject, is neither circulary nor ridiculous. Besides, Sir, what proof had we for the Church, before there was any Scripture extant? And cannot the same Proof be employ'd now as well as then, to shew the true Church of *Jesus Christ*. You see then, Sir, we are in no danger of running in a *Circle*, and that we can easily keep out on't, without using any of your Author's Enchantments.

Case stat. page 35. Vide page 36, initio.

74. Your Author, in the Second Answer of this Sect, presses his Lord with Questions which please himself, but make nothing against us, for we never deny'd

Ca. p. 35. The 12th §. refuted.

that all bottoms upon our own Reason, nor do we *ever strive* to *escape from it*; and no People in the World use it more in proper Occasions, than we do, we only captivate it, when it pretends to meddle with things *beyond* its reach: In a word, we believe but what your Author himself is forc'd to admit in this Matter: We take *purely upon Revelation many things taught us, of the Nature, Power, Infinity*, &c. *of God*; *those our Reason cou'd never have found out, nor perfectly understand*, yet God will have us, upon Pain of Damnation, not only believe 'em, but also rightly believe 'em; for an Erroneous Belief is no Divine Faith: True Faith then being the right way to Heaven, we *think it inconsistant with the Goodness of God, not to give us an Infallible Guide, to lead us in that right Way, since our own Reason is so weak that we cannot trust to it* in those Matters of Pure Revelation, *and that Guide is the Church*. This, Sir, is our Opinion, and as I have said already, your Author himself is forc'd to own that those *Matters* of pure Revelation, are no Objects of Reason, yet now he'll have us believe pure Revelation directly upon Reason. This indeed is something like a Contradiction, but your Author has a right to contradict himself, and I freely consent he shou'd use this Privilege against us, as often as he pleases.

Vide Case stated, *pa.* 47.

Case stat. *page* 47.

Case p. 36. 75. Your Author is very willing to Exercise his Conjuring Art, and again offers his Service *to bring us out of the Old Circle*; but by what means does he attempt to bring us out;

out? 1. By asking *whether we believe a God.* And this is a pretty good Beginning for a Conjurer. 2. By saying *twou'd be Blasphemy to say we believe it upon any Authority.* And why? *Because that wou'd place such an Authority above God.* Well, and does believing a thing upon a *Motive*, place that *Motive above* the thing believ'd? Your Author says *we believe a God purely upon our own Reason.* But according to this *'tis Blasphemy in him to say so*; *because* that is *placing it above God*: But which is more wonderful, according to your Author, God has *given us no other Guide to believe in Himself*, that's to say, He has *given us* something *above Himself to believe in Him!* A strong Proof of His Wisdom! And which is still more surprizing, by this means *He* makes us commit this same *Blasphemy!* A Convincing Proof of his Goodness! And, Sir, are not these Thoughts very becoming the Author of *Christianity demonstrated*! Ibidem.

76. Your Author adds that *we cannot be more sure there is a God, than we are persuaded of the Truth of those Reasons upon which we do believe it.* If so, then I ask your Author whether we are *infallibly* sure or *probably* sure, *there is a God*? If we are *infallibly* sure, then we are *infallible* in this: And then what becomes of your Author's Principles, that *there is no Infallibility among Men*, that *none are infallible but those who are impeccable*, &c. if we are but *probably* sure, then 'tis but *probable there is a God*; then for Ibidem.

ought we certainly know, *there is* no *God*. Then *probably*, if we can ſhelter our ſelves from humane Laws, we may do any thing for Intereſt or Pleaſure; *ſwear*, *cheat*, *lye*, *ſlander*, &c. and who knows but your Author was guided by this Principle, when he impos'd upon us, a Poor Diſtreſs'd People, the *Calumnies*, *&c.* you ſee in every Page of his Book? I am willing to ſuſpend my Judgment, but believe me Sir, this hint I give is not altogether unworthy your ſerious Conſideration.

Ibidem. 77. But ſays your Author, if *God has given us no other Guide but our own Reaſon, with the Aſſiſtance of His Grace, to believe in Himſelf; if this be all we have, or can have, for the Firſt and main Article of our Creed, what further do we require for thoſe of leſs Conſequence*? Very well, Sir, then we need no other Guide but our Reaſon for thoſe other Articles of our Creed, the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, *Reſurrection*, &c. but how can this agree with what your Author ſays in another Place of his Book, that *he takes theſe purely upon the Revelation that is given of them in Scripture, for his own Reaſon cou'd never have found 'em out.* So, Sir, you ſee he owns here, that God has given him another Guide *viz. Revelation.* This is a Contradiction; but as I told you already, I ſhall not hinder him from contradicting himſelf as often as he pleaſes, in his Diſputes againſt us: All that I deſire is that you ſhou'd take ſome notice of it.

Caſe ſtated, *p.* 47.

78.

78. What your Author adds is entirely destructive of *Christian* Faith; and I ask him whether he believes with *less Assurance* the *Incarnation*, *Trinity*, &c. *upon the Authority of Scripture*, than he *believes a God upon his Reason*. If he does, then there is some Doubt in his Belief of those Misteries; then for ought he certainly knows, they may be fictitious, and *Christianity* but an Imposture. A blessed Fruit of *Private Judgment*! But thus it is with your People, whilst they admit only a Moral Certainty in Faith, they expose Religion to the Scorn of all Unbelievers. The Incomparable Author of *Sure-footing* has unanswerably prov'd this, against your *Tillot. Sill. &c.* so I shall say nothing of it now; but I answer your Author's Question, and assure him that I am not *more undoubtedly assur'd of the Being of a God, than of Transubstantiation, Trinity, Incarnation*, &c. which I believe upon *Revelation* propes'd by the Church. What can your Author make of this Answer? And is not all he has said here a rare way of *bringing us out of our Old Circle*! I. S. Sure-footing, &c.

70. *To say God is oblig'd*, in due Circumstances, to *give an Infallible Guide, is not making too bold with his Providence, but justifying* His Goodness; for if He will not save us *but* by True *Faith*, and that we cannot certainly know this True *Faith*, but by an *Infallible Guide*, His *Justice*, *Wisdom*, and *Goodness*, require He should *appoint* such an one, to lead us *in the Right Way*. Your Author's Reflections on *Inanimates*, *Animals*, Case, *pag.* 37.

mals, *Rationals*, &c. are nothing to the purpose; and tho' he boldly asserts the contrary, *according to our Argument*, *there is no Respect of Persons* with God, *nor has His Goodness fail'd any*: For whenever a Right Belief of Reveal'd Religion was necessary to Salvation, there has been, and there is still an Outward *Guide*, for all to consult. *Jesus Christ* was a Sufficient Outward *Guide*, to all in his time. This, sure, your Author cannot deny. The *Church* is now a sufficient Outward *Guide* to *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, *Hereticks*, but the Misfortune is, their own Blindness, and their blind *Guides*, hinder 'em from consulting this outward *Infallible Guide*; but that will not justify 'em before God; *without True Faith it is impossible to please Him*, and He has openly declar'd *that he who does not believe*, *shall everlastingly be damn'd*: And if your Author had consider'd this, he would not have made such an Apology as you see here, for the Salvation of Heathens and Infidels.

Heb. ii. 6. Mark xvi. 16.

71. Now, Sir, let us examine his Doctrine a little upon this Matter. According as he states the Case, there's no Man of Sense but had rather be an Infidel than a *Christian*; for if Infidels *have not so many Advantages as* Christians in *some* things, they have at least as many in others: It is true, they have not *the Rapture and Joy with which the Sight of the wonderful Oeconomy of our Redemption*, *fills the Souls of* Christians, but then they have not near so many grievous Temptations to overcome: *Natural Religion*

Case stated, p. 38.

Religion is *planted in their Hearts*, and 'tis not exceeding difficult to believe and practise it; but is there any *Christian* that does not find it very difficult to believe several Mysteries of *Reveal'd Religion?* Yet he must firmly believe 'em, resist all Temptations, *&c.* or be damn'd, *&c.* What a dangerous Condition! And who would not prefer the State of an Infidel, free from such grievous Temptations, before that of a *Christian*, continually expos'd to 'em, during his whole Life? If there was any Merit to be expected by being expos'd to such horrid Dangers, perhaps it would not be altogether so surprizing; but this is downright *Popery*, and so can be of no use to your *Author*, for supporting his Opinion. *Covenanted* or *Uncovenanted Mercy* it is the same thing, since they are sav'd: If an Estate is got either by Covenant, Gift, Chance, Purchase, or any Lawful Way, 'tis all one, so it be certainly enjoy'd and possess'd. I say it again, who would not chuse to be an Infidel rather than a *Christian*, as your Author states the Case! *The 13th Section answer'd.* Cas. p. 39

81. Sir, I have often wonder'd why your M—sters never minded the Conversion of Infidels: Indeed I knew that a pretty Wife and a parcel of Children were powerful Motives to keep 'em at home; but then I consider'd that Zeal for the Salvation of Souls could make 'em *carry about with 'em their Wives*, as *Saint* Peter *and the Apostles did*, if we believe your Translation. I own this wou'd be a little troublesome, especially

especially if *their Wives* Bellies were up; but what cannot a true Zeal for *Christ* go through? Now your Author has disclos'd the Mystery: Indeed, you may reform the Abuses of *Christianity*, but 'tis not your business to convert *Infidels*: Let foolish *Papists* venture their Lives to make *'em Christians*, when that is done, your business is to make *'em Reform'd Christians*? If you shou'd preach to 'em, 'tis not one in twenty wou'd be converted, and the *Unbelievers wou'd certainly be damned*, if what *Jesus Christ* says be true: Since the Case is thus, it would be barbarous to expose 'em to manifest Damnation, and that *only* to give 'em *inward Raptures*, &c. *upon considering the Oeconomy of our Redemption*, &c. *they may be sav'd by* Christ, *tho' they never heard of Him*. Whatever way they are sav'd, it is well enough. Your Behaviour in the whole is both Reasonable and *Christian*! I thank your Author for this rare Discovery, and I promise him, that in future Disputes with those of his Communion, I shall use no more the Conversion of Infidels, as an Argument against their Religion.

Mar. xvi. 16.

Case stat. p. 38.

82. But, Sir, before we go any further, give me leave to use here one of your Author's *Inconceivables*. *That many may be sav'd by* Christ, *who never heard of Him*, I easily conceive, *since He made satisfaction to Infinite Justice for 'em*; but since this *Satisfaction* of *Christ*, and the Practice of *Natural Religion*, *may save the* Gentils, *who never heard of Him*, is it not *inconceivable* that *J. Christ*

Christ shou'd command His Disciples to preach his Doctrine to *all the Gentiles*, and occasion so many *Dissentions*, *Animosities*, *Rebellions*, *Massacres*, *Martyrdoms*, *&c.* in the World, and all this *not* to save People from Damnation, but, according to your Author, to *inflame their Devotion*, *invigorate their Obedience*, *and give more compunction to their Repentance*, than *otherwise* they wou'd have had: For *Devotion*, *Obedience*, and *Compunction*, being Duties of *Natural Religion*, *those who never heard of* Christ, are bound, in proper Occasions, to practise 'em. I cou'd add many more *Inconceivables* here, but this is enough, till your Author can shew, 1. How this Conduct of *J. Christ* agrees with His Infinite Goodness and Wisdom, 2. How his Doctrine agrees with the 18th *Article* of his own Religion. And 3. How it agrees with that of the Primitive Fathers, *who bid us belive for certain*, *and not doubt*, *that Pagans*, Jews, *Hereticks*, *and Schismaticks*, *who dye out of the Church*, *are to go into Everlasting Fire*. Caf. *p.* 39. *Aug.* Ep. *Bonif.* & Ep. 152 *ad Dona.* &c.

83. Now your Author has done with his Cant, and makes a shew of some Passages, which he pretends do favour his Opinion of the Salvation of Heathens, but not one Word of 'em can be strain'd to the Meaning he gives 'em. That *Job was out of the Pale of the Church* is a Mistake, for he was in the Way of Salvation, which cannot be *out of the Church*; and let your Author shew you what Church there was in *Job*'s time, and I'll engage to find him *Job* in it. The *Fulgent.* l. de Fid. ad *Pet.* & alij passim.

Gentles

Gentiles your Author mentions were Converts to the Faith, as *Christ* Himself manifestly declares: To the Woman of *Canaan* he says, *O Woman, great is thy Faith*; to the Centurion, I *have not found so great Faith in* Israel; to the *Samaritan*, *Thy Faith, hath made the whole.* Neither the Comparison of the *Samaritan*, Priest, and Levite, nor what *Jesus Christ* said of the Widow of *Sarepta*, and *Naaman* the *Syrian*, can be of any use to your Author, as I see, for maintaining his Opinion, unless he thinks this Argument good; *A* Samaritan *cur'd a wounded Man*, *A* Prophet *went to the Widow of* Sarepta, Naaman *was cur'd of a Leprosy*; ergo Gentiles *may be sav'd without Faith in* Christ. And what *Papist* is able to withstand such a convincing Argument!

Mat. xv. 28.
Luke vii. 9.
Ibid. xvii. 18.
Ib. x. 30.
Ibid. iv. 25, &c.

84. Your Author is much mistaken when he gives the Name of *Rage* to the Zeal we have for the Salvation of Souls. We are griev'd to see poor People deluded with specious Stories, and concern'd to see 'em lull'd into a careless Security, when they are in the most horrid Danger. We cry out to awaken 'em, to undeceive 'em, and to bring them into the Right Way. We tell 'em what the *Holy Ghost* says, that *there is but One God, and One Faith, without which 'tis impossible to please* Him, and *wo to us, if we do not preach to 'em this Gospel.* And, Sir, can this be justly call'd *Rage?* But he is concern'd we should be so *zealous* against *Christians*, who, 1. *Hold the Three Ancient Creeds*; and 2. *Have every thing essential to a Church*

Cas. p. 41.
Heb. xi. St. Paul.

Church, except what Rome *has made so.* Very well, Sir, and does your Author think *the holding of the three Creeds* sufficient? If he does, then he think *Presbyterians*, &c. in a Good State, tho' they be noted Schismaticks, and have no Ordinations nor Sacraments, *&c.* 2. Does he think that this *Sect*, having no Ordination, or Authority to *preach*, or administer *Sacraments*, have *every thing essential to a Church, except the Supremacy*? Examine, Sir, one of the 39 *Articles* of your Religion, consider how it agrees with your Author's Doctrine, and then I desire you may sincerely give your Judgment upon the whole Matter.

85. That the *Church of* Rome *has made the Unlimited Sovereignty of her Bishop essential to a Church*, is most untrue, as I have shewn you already, but it is true *that she stands single by her self*, and *thrusts from her all* Hereticks, Schismaticks, *&c.* whom he calls *Christian Churches*; and this too I have told you already: As for the *Cappadocian* Bishop *Firmilian*, I hope your Author will not deny he maintain'd a Wrong Cause against St. *Stephen*; yet in all his furious Violence, he never question'd Pope *Stephen*'s Authority, but blaim'd only the *use* he made of it against him and others, who taught the Rebaptization of Hereticks. What he says of the *Jewish* Church has been refuted already, and shall be again on another Occasion. What he objects from the *Romans* and Saint *Luke*, has likewise been answer'd: The *Seven Thousand who had not bow'd to* Baal, *&c.* is

Supra.

Supra, *Cas.* p. 42.

Case stat. p. 42 & 43.

no

no Advantage to your Author's Cauſe; for at the ſame time the Church was ſo viſible in the Kingdom of *Juda*, that the Soldiers alone were above a Million. Beſides, did we ever deny that the Church may be hid and quite ſuppreſs'd in ſome Places? We only maintain that ſhe cannot be ſo hid and ſuppreſs'd in all the World, but that ſhe may be found by thoſe who are willing to be of her. What your Author adds of the State of the

Caſe ſtat. pag. 44. *Church of the Depravity, Corruption*, &c. is but groundleſs Conjecture, without any Proof, and ſo not worthy of any Notice.

86. Sir, I own ſincerely that I cannot underſtand what your Author means by theſe Words,

Ibidem. *If there ſhall be a viſible Church in thoſe Days, then that Church, at leaſt the Generality, which is the Viſibility of it, will fall from the Faith, elſe it wou'd be found viſibly upon the Earth.* Does he mean that *if there ſhall be a Viſible Church in thoſe Days, then* it will *be viſibly found*? If he does, what makes him ſpeak ſo obſcurely of a thing which we never deny'd? Does he mean, that *if the Church* falls *from the Faith*, then ſhe *cannot be viſibly found upon Earth*? And does any one deny this? *If* the *Church* falls *from the Faith*, then ſhe is no more the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and undoubtedly what is not *in being* is not *viſible*; but then how can what he adds happen, that *Men will be miſled by the Church*, which is inviſible, and not *in being*? I wiſh, Sir, your Author wou'd be pleas'd to give us a clearer Notion of ſo many curious Thoughts, which he has here heap'd together!

ther! What he adds concerning the *Jewish* Church shall be answer'd in its due Place; in the mean time, I must own, your Author has an excellent Method of dealing with all sorts of Adversaries! When he has to do with *Deists* then *the* Jews *understood those Prophesies of the* Massiah, now he has to do with the *Papists the* Jews *did not understand those Prophesies of the* Massiah, but who can blame him for defending his Cause as well as he can! If the Author of the *Detection, &c.* does not perceive it, all is well enough, but if he does, Wo be to a certain Book call'd *Christianity demonstrated.* Case stat. *pag.* 45. Christianity Demonstrated, *Page* 99 & 108. Case stat. *p.* 45.

87. Here your Author makes his silly Lord speak foolishly, and then confutes him with a Magisterial Air: *Christ being come*, says the *Popish* Lord, *He was then the Church. He was not the Church*, says your Author, *He did not come to redeem Himself, He was the Head, the Church the Body, but the Head is not the Body.* And what *Papist* in the World ever deny'd what your Author answers here, or said that *Jesus Church was the Church*? On another Occasion your Author himself own'd *that we say* Christ *is not the Church, but came to redeem the Church*, &c. but *then* was *then*, and *now* is *now. Oportet Mendacem esse memorem.* Ibidem. Christianity Demonstrated, *Page* 188.

88. Now your Author comes to what he thinks decisive, and which he uses as an invincible Argument against us, in his *Christianity demonstrated.* After proposing some *Jewish* Objections, and urging them against us, as well as he can, he concludes that upon the *the Foot of Authority of the Church, it was* Case stat. *p.* 46.

was impossible, in the Messiah's *time, for a* Jew *to be a* Christian. Sir, If the *Jewish* Church, before the Coming of *Christ*, did believe that her Infallibility was perpetual, I own what your Author says is true; but it is evident that she believ'd her Infallibility was but temporal, and to continue till the Time of the *Messiah*; for she believ'd that *at that time* she was to fall into grievous Errors, that she was to reject, torment, kill, *&c.* the *Messiah.* And, Sir, cou'd she then believe that such grievous Errors were compatible with her Infallibility? No Man in his Wits can imagine this. Now that the *Jewish* Church believed that she was to fall into grievous Errors, at the time of the *Messiah*, is also evident, and I'll prove it from your Author's own Words. I have here his *Christianity demonstrated*; in this Book he owns and proves too, as much as can be desired, for my purpose: After he has mention'd the Prophesies concerning the Rejection, Passion, Death, *&c.* of the *Messiah*, he says, *that before the Coming of Christ the* Jews *understood those Texts, as we do, to be certainly meant of the* Messiah, *and of none other; but since that time they have forced themselves to put the most Strain'd and Contradictory Meanings upon them, &c.* He says the same thing in other Places of his Book: And now Sir, since the *Jews understood those* Prophesies of the *Messiah*, 'tis evident that they believ'd their Church was to decide a grievous Error, that she was to reject the *Messiah*, *&c.* and that her Infallibility was

Christianity Demonstrat. *Page* 99. *Ib. p.* 108. 128.

was then to ceaſe; therefore *at that time* by her own Doctrine, no *Jew* was bound to ſubmit to her Authority, and every *Jew* was bound to reject it in the *Meſſiah*'s Caſe, when they ſaw a Man appear with the true Signs of the *Meſſiah*, as *Miracles*, *&c.* they had grounds to believe that the Propheſies of the *Meſſiah*, which their Church, whilſt ſhe was infallible, had taught 'em, were then fulfilled; and in thoſe Circumſtances, nothing cou'd be a ſtronger Motive to make 'em believe the *Meſſiah*, than his very Rejection, Condemnation, Death, *&c.* And how then can what your Author affirms be true, that *upon the Foot of the Authority of the Church, it was impoſſible for a* Jew, *in the* Meſſiah's *time, to be a* Chriſtian?

Further, to convince you more, that *upon the Foot of Authority, it was* not *impoſſible for a* Jew, *in* Chriſt's *time, to be a* Chriſtian, I ſhall make uſe of a *Method* which your Author eſteems, and which he uſes in his darling Treaty of *Private Judgment*: There he introduces a *Jew* diſputing with a *Roman Catholick*, who is reduced to great ſtraits; and no wonder, ſince your Author had both the making and anſwering of the Objections. Now I introduce a *Roman Catholick* diſputing with a *Jew*, *at that time*, and convincing him by the very *Authority* of his own Church, that *Chriſt* is the *Meſſiah*; and if I do this with Succeſs, I hope your Author will not ſay for the future, that of *all Men* Chriſtians *have the leaſt reaſon to inſiſt upon Authority*.

Chriſtianity demonſtrat. *page* 187.

(*R.*) *Jesus Christ* is the *Messiah*, and you sho'd believe in Him. (*Jew.*) He is not the *Messiah*, for the Church, whose Decision is *infallible*, has rejected Him. (*Cat.*) You are mistaken, your Church is not infallible; she has been so, I own, but now she has lost that Blessing. (*Jew.*) How can you prove that? (*C.*) By the Judgment of your own Church: She declares her Infallibility is but *temporal*, and to continue till the Coming of the *Messiah*; for she teaches that she is to reject Him, that she shall not know Him, that she will persecute him to Death, *&c.* Therefore she owns she'll be deceiv'd, and that you must not submit to her *Authority*, for she wou'd not command you to obey her *Authority* in a thing she owns to be wicked; she owns it wou'd be a wicked thing to *reject* the *Messiah*, and yet she owns and teaches that she will do it; therefore by her own *Authority* you are discharged from obeying her, and commanded to follow her former against her present Decisions; therefore if this *Jesus Christ*, Whom she rejects, has the other Marks of the *Messiah* mention'd in the *Prophets*, the pretended *Infallibility* of your Church cannot be a Hindrance to your believing in Him. *Now Sir, you think it inconsistent with the Goodness of God, not to appoint an Infallible Guide to lead us in the right* Way; this Guide must be either your Church or ours, for no other pretends to it. I have prov'd it cannot be yours, therefore it must be ours; and so you are bound not only

only to be a *Christian*, but also a *R. Cath. Christian.* This is a Demonstration against the *Jews*, if what your Author says be true, that the *Jews understood the Prophesies of the* Messiah. Now let us see how your Author, according to his Principles, can convert a *Jew*; and let us hear each of 'em defend himself. (*Author.*) *Jesus Christ* is the *Messiah*, and you shou'd believe in Him. (*Jew.*) He is not the *Messiah*, for the infallible Church has rejected Him. (*Au.*) Your Church is not, nor ever was infallible. (*Jew.*) How! The Guide appointed of God to teach Reveal'd Truth, not infallible! *'Tis inconsistent with Gods Goodness to leave Men without a sufficient Guide in Matters of Faith, and not to preserve that Guide from misleading us to the Ruin of our Souls.* (Auth.) *Infallibility is no where, nor can it be among Men, who are all fallible*; *and to say that God is oblig'd to give every Man an Outward infallible Guide, is making too bold with Providence, and measuring His Infinite Wisdom and Goodness by our short Line*, &c. *Private Judgment is all we have for the belief of a God, or of* Christ, &c. *In short we must trust to it in every thing without Exception*, &c. (*Jew.*) Why then my *Private Judgment* tells me that nothing is more reasonable than to submit to the Church in Matters of *pure Revelation*, which *my Reason could never have found out, nor can perfectly understand.* (*Auth.*) Your *Judgment* is mistaken, you must endeavour to have it better informed. (*Jew.*) I say your's is mistaken, and how shall we know who is in

Christianity Demonstrated, *Page* 188. Case stat. p. 26. Ib. p. 36. Ib. p. 37.

the right? We may dispute on at this rate till *Doomsday*, to no purpose. Besides, suppose *your* Reasons should convince me now, *other* Reasons may make me change, then upon *other* Reasons I may change again; thus I may be in a continual Uncertainty, to day a *Jew*, to morrow a *Christian*, then a *Jew*, and so on, according as my *Private Judgment* may like or dislike the Reasons given by each Party. What a strange State of Religion is this? Especially if Salvation depends on *Truth*, and not upon *Opinion*. I say it again, I have another notion of God's Goodness: If He will save us but by a True Faith, He certainly will appoint a sure *Guide* to lead us in the Right Way: This my *Private Judgment* tells me, you say *I must trust to it in every thing without Exception*; and if I do, I am certain I shall little mind whatever you can say for your Religion or your *Messiah*. (*Auth.*) You should believe in *Jesus Christ*; *for His Heavenly Doctrine, His Miracles, and the Prophesies of Him, prove Him to be the* Messiah. (*Jew.*) Our Church has declar'd His Doctrine false, His Miracles fictitious, and that the Prophesies were not to be understood of Him. (*Auth.*) *Before the Coming of* Christ, *the* Jews *understood those Prophesies, as we do, to be meant certainly of the* Messiah, *and of none other; but since that time they have put the most Strain'd and Contradictory Meanings upon them.* (*Jew.*) How cou'd they understand these Prophesies of the *Messiah*, and believe at the same time their

Christianity Demonstrat. *Page 99.*

Infallibility

Infallibility was *perpetual*, *unconditional*, *indefeasible*, as you own they did? Is it possible they were so stupid as to think their Infallibility was compatible with the Rejection of the chief Article of their Faith, the *Messiah*? Besides, Sir, how can this agree with what you say in a Book lately publish'd against the *Papists*: There, after you have quoted some Passages out of the Prophets, to prove that the Promises of *Infallibility*, *Indefectibility*, &c. were only conditional, you add, Case stat. p. 29.

1. *This was the Language of the Prophets to the* Jewish *Church, but she understood it not, but leant upon the Promises made to her as unconditional and indefeasible, let her be as wicked as she would; and this harden'd her against the Prophets*, &c. 2. Upon the Lord's objecting that *it was propheſy'd in the Old Testament that the* Jews *should reject their* Messiah *at His coming*, you answer *that the* Jews *did not so understand these Propheſies against themselves*, &c. (*Auth*) O! But *Papists* are *Papists*, and *Jews* are *Jews*—— Very good, Sir! And no doubt but these Arguments are excellent to make a *Jew* turn *Christian*! And now, Sir, after all that I have said, give me leave to make here one little *Dilemma*; either the *Jews* understood the Propheſies of the *Messiah*, or they did not! If they did, then all your Author's Objections from the Authority of the *Jewish* Church, prove nothing against us, and so the *Case stated* falls to the Ground: If they did not, then all that your Author has said against *Deists*, *&c.* signifies nothing, Caſ. p. 45.

and then what becomes of that celebrated Book, *Christianity demonstrated*? Let your Author take his choice, he is here shut up in a *Circle*; he offers his Service officiously to bring others out of Circles, Charity begins at home, and let him conjure himself out of this if he can. In the mean time here's another Circle to shut him in, when he has got out of this. Either the *Jews* believ'd the Infallible Authority was in the High Priest and *Sanhedrin*, or in a General Council made up of the High Priest, and all their Priests, assembled from all Parts of the World: If the first, they having now neither High Priest nor *Sanhedrin*, they have no more Infallibility, and therefore they cannot use now that Principle, which your Author says they do, *viz*, *That it is inconsistent with the Goodness of God to leave Men without a sufficient Guide in Matters of Faith, and not preserve that Guide from misleading us, to the Ruin of our Souls.* If the second, then it being evident that the Council which condemn'd *Jesus Christ* was not a General one, made up of the High Priests and others, *&c.* It is likewise evident that the *Jews* were not bound to believe its *Decision*, *Sentence*, &c. against *Jesus Christ*, and therefore it was not impossible for them to believe he was the *Messiah*, tho' they adher'd to the Authority of the Church. 'Tis no easy matter to get over this Circle. But I'll warrant your Author will conjure himself out of it, as soon as he has got out of the other; for we know he is a very excellent Artist! 89.

Christianity Demonstrated, *Page* 188.

89. Sir, I have very good Grounds to believe your Author is no Friend to *Papists*, and who knows but, in Spite to *Popery*, he may give up *Christianity demonstrated* to the *Deists*, and stand by what he says in this Book, *viz.* 1. That the *Jews* did not understand those Prophesies of the *Messiah*; and 2. That they believ'd their Infallibility was perpetual. But Sir, if the *Jews* believ'd such a damnable Error as their Perpetual Infallibility, an Error which made it *impossible* for 'em to believe the *Messiah*, an Error which was to be the Cause of rejecting and murdering the *Messiah*, *&c.* 1. Is *it not inconceivable* that no Levite, Priest, Prophet, *&c.* in the whole Nation, ever attempted to undeceive 'em, and teach 'em in plain terms the dreadful Consequences of it? *&c.* 2. Is *it not inconceivable* that God always look'd upon them as His Chosen People, notwithstanding their being all involv'd in this damnable Error; and is *it not inconceivable* that He put them in expectation of a *Messiah*, and then suffer'd 'em, above all People on Earth, to take up an Error which put them in an absolute necessity of rejecting and murdering this *Messiah*, so often promis'd, and so long expected. 3. Is *it not inconceivable* that the Prophets, *&c.* far from instructing and undeceiving 'em, seem rather to confirm 'em in the Belief of so pernicious an Error? 4. Is *it not* more *inconceivable* that *Jesus Christ* Himself, never told them of it, or convinc'd 'em of its Heinousness; since without this Conviction, it was in vain for Him to work Mira-

Mal. ii. 7. Is. lix. 21.

cles. *&c.* for their Converſion. 5. Is *it not inconceivable* that He ſeems rather to confirm 'em in it, by commanding His Diſciples to obſerve and do what the *Jewiſh* Paſtors ſhou'd order? *&c.* 6. Is *it not inconceivable* that not one Apoſtle ever ſpoke of this Error, ſo fatal to the *Jews*, or ever repreſented to 'em its damnable Conſequences? 7. Is *it not inconceivable* that not one *Jew*, in all their Diſputes with the Ancient Fathers, ever made uſe of the Advantage this Principle gave 'em? You know, Sir, what Advantages we make of it againſt your People; by it we are always ſure of Victory, and if we come to the diſcuſſion of ſome particular Points, 'tis but mere Condeſcenſion: And to ſhew you that we can encounter and defeat you, even in your own Way. 8. Is *it not inconceivable* that not one Ancient Father ever took notice of ſuch a monſtrous Error, the only Cauſe of the Perdition and Continual Obſtinacy of the *Jews*, *&c.* If Negative Arguments are of any force, I ſee none more convincing than theſe are. Your Author ſeems to be much taken with this way of arguing, I wiſh theſe Arguments may make a deep impreſſion in his Mind.

The 14 Section refuted. Caſe ſtat. *p.* 46, 47.

90. Your Author having entirely rejected any Authority, now comes to his beloved Rule, *Private Judgment*. *It is all we have*, ſays he, *for the Belief of a God, or of* Chriſt, *in ſhort we muſt truſt to it in every thing*. How does this agree with what he ſays in the very next Anſwer, *viz. That there*

there are many things which he takes purely upon Revelation, for his Reason cou'd never have found 'em out, nor can perfectly understand 'em? But, Sir, wou'd you know the Character of this Guide *which God has given us, and to which we must trust in every thing?* Your Author himself thus represents it in his *Christianity demonstrated*, *The Effects*, says he, *of Private Judgment are these*, Multiplicitly of Sects and Opinions, Perpetual Wranglings, without any Umpire, or Judge of Controversy, *whence come inveterate Prejudices against each other, Animosities, Strifes, Envyings, and all the War of Religion, which the most of any one thing, embroils the Peace of the World, and is always the chief Pretence in the civil Wars of Nations within themselves, and most commonly in the Wars of Kingdoms against Kingdoms*, &c. This, This is the Guide that God has given, to lead us strait to Heaven, and who can sufficiently admire His Wisdom and Goodness, in providing for us (Poor Mortals) such an excellent Guide! But Sir, since *Private Judgment is the only Guide we must trust to in every thing*; when you were in power, why then 1. Did you make Penal Laws, to hinder People from following this *Private Judgment*? You damn'd their Souls if they did not follow it, and you tormented their Bodies if they did. Con'd there be any Tyranny comparable to this? You'll say you hinder *Private Judgment* to be follow'd when it leads astray; but who made you Judge of that? Have you more right to judge

Christ. dem. *page* 181, 182.

judge of me, then I have to judge of you? Muſt I ſubmit my Judgment to yours, when you tell me I am wrong? And if I muſt, why not as well to the Judgment of the Church, when ſhe tells me the ſame thing? 2. If it be *the only Guide*, why does your Author admit *Revelation* as another? For he takes *purely upon Revelation*, *many things in God*, &c. And this is exactly what we do: I have ſaid it already, no People in the World uſe *Private Judgment* more than we do, in due Circumſtances, we only reſtrain it to its proper Objects; *we take purely upon Revelation what our own Reaſon cou'd never have found out; nor can perfectly underſtand:* And why then does your Author exclaim ſo much againſt us, ſince we do nothing but what he himſelf is forc'd to do?

91. As to what he adds, I know it *wou'd be unreaſonable to think there was nothing in the Natures of the Infinite Being, which I did not comprehend.* But I can't ſee how this proves that ſome things, which appear to be manifeſtly againſt Reaſon, are *in the Infinite Being*, (For Example, that Three are One, and One Three, *&c.*) neither can I conceive how 'tis *as much againſt Reaſon to deny that* One is Three, *as to deny there was any Country or Star, which I had not ſeen.* A *Deiſt* may laugh in his ſleeve, to hear ſuch Reaſons given for our Myſteries. This is not defending but expoſing *Chriſtianity*, and every true *Chriſtian* ſhould look with Horror, not only upon this,

this, but especially upon his Blasphemies against the Holy Trinity.

22. Sir, hitherto I believ'd your Author was an Enemy to the *Socinians*, and that he had an Orthodox Notion of the Holy Trinity; I find now I have been mistaken, and according as he expresses his Belief of it, there's no *Sandius*, *Brenius*, *Clendon*, *&c.* in the World, but will readily subscribe to it. *Because*, says he, *Personal Actions are attributed to the Divine Three, therefore we call 'em Persons, which Word the Scripture applies to God*, Heb. i. 3. *but it is only* ad captum, *as the Schools speak, that is condescending to our Capacity, as when God is said to repent or grieve*, &c. *it is not that we shou'd think it really so; for that wou'd be contradictory to the Nature of God*, &c. Now, Sir, if the Divine Three are Persons, *because* Personal Actions are attributed to 'em, then before those Actions were *attributed* to 'em, they were not Persons, *&c.* 2. If they *are call'd Persons only* ad Captum, *and not that we shou'd think it really so*, then we must not think there are any real Persons in the *Trinity*, and, Sir, can any *Christian* Ears bear such execrable Blasphemies? Sir, what have poor *Papists* done to your Author that gives him such a Hatred against 'em? For he sticks at nothing to do them all the mischief he can; he has heretofore defended Revelation against the *Deists*, *Christianity* against the *Jews*, and the *Trinity* against the *Socinians*; now in this Book he gives up *Revelation*, *Christianity*, *the Trinity*, all, that he may distress Caf. p. 48.

distress *Popery*. We are sorry to see your Author in such a Passion, but we are not sorry to see what Shifts our Enemies are put to, and that they cannot annoy us, but at the same time they must destroy all *Revelation*, all *Christianity*, all Mysteries. And I repeat here what I have said already, *This is worthy the peculiar Care and serious Consideration of any Man who thinks he has a Soul to be sav'd.*

Case stat. p. 48, 49. 93. All your Author says in his 15 Sect. amounts to no more than this; *The* Deist *is forc'd to confess, upon the Conviction of his own Reason*, that there is *a First Cause, which is necessary, eternal*, &c. That *Eternity is without Beginning, past, or to come.* Therefore he must believe this *First Cause* may be One and Three, *&c.* tho' *upon the Conviction of his own Reason* he finds it impossible! I don't know what you may think of this Argument, but I am as much afraid as your Author's Lord is, *that the* Deists *will think it a Straining the Point in favour of Revelation.* Indeed if a *Deist*, *upon the Conviction of his own Reason*, cou'd know there's Three Persons in One Deity, as he knows, *upon the Conviction of* his *Reason*, that *Eternity* has neither *Beginning* nor Ending, your Author's Argument wou'd have something in it, and a *Deist* would be unreasonable if he should deny this Mystery, *because* he cannot *comprehend it*, as he wou'd be unreasonable if he shou'd deny *Eternity*, *because* he cannot *comprehend it.* But you see this is not the Case—— But, Sir, now

I think on't, I beg your Author's Pardon; according to the Notion he gives of the *Trinity*, any *Deist* may easily comprehend it; for who is so stupid as not to comprehend *Clendon's Manifestations, &c.* This perhaps is your Author's Meaning, which I had almost forgot; Sir, excuse my Want of Memory!

94. Now your Author's Lord proposes a *Deistical* Question, which is a little puzzling. *What Authority*, says the *Deist*, *have you to believe Scripture?* *No Authority*, says your Author, *it is Evidence, and not Authority, upon which my Belief of the Scripture is founded*, By the by, I must here observe that your Author is not of Saint *Augustin's* Religion; for he declares it *is Authority upon which his Belief of the Scriptures is founded*) Your Author proves this Opinion as well as he can, and answers the *Deist's* Objections as well as he can 1. *I believe*, says he, *the Scripture, and the Facts therein related, upon the same, and much Stronger Evidence, than I have for believing there was such a Man as* Alexander, *or* Cæsar, *or that there is such a Town as* Rome, *or* Constantinople, *tho' I was never there.* To this the *Deist*, may easily reply, that *the Scripture* cannot *be believ'd upon the same Evidence*, much less a *Stronger*; for no Man in his Senses ever deny'd *there was such a Man as* Alexander, &c. *or that there is such a Town as* Rome, &c. but thousands of *Learned Men* have deny'd *Scripture* to be the Word of God, in all Ages from the Beginning down to our Days. And I think this makes a *vast* Difference between the

Case stat. *pag.* 50, 51.

Aug. cont. Ep. func. c. v.

the *Evidence* we have for *Cæsar*, *Rome*, *&c.* and the *Evidence* we have for Holy *Scripture*.

Case, *page* 51. 2. *I believe it*, says your Author, *from the Nature of the Evidence, which makes it impossible to concert such a Lye, or to carry it on without being detected.* If a *Papist* shou'd urge this Reason, I own it wou'd be pressing; but that any of your Party should use it against *Deists*, it is most ridiculous; for according to your Principle, *it is not impossible to concert such a Lye, or carry it on, without being detected*; and your whole Reformation is grounded upon the Possibility *of concerting such a Lye.* Don't you declare that the Church of *Rome conterted the Lye* and notorious Imposture of *Transubstantiation*, *&c. and carry'd it on* a long while *without being detected*? Sure you cannot deny this. Now Sir, if the Church of *Rome* did *concert such a* monstrous imposture; if she cheated insensibly so many Nations, divided by Antipathy, Interest, Government, *&c.* into the Belief of this Imposture; if, against the plain Doctrine of *Christ*, the universal Practise of *Christians*, and the clear Reason and Sense of Mankind, she made 'em believe that a Bit of Bread was their God, made 'em fall down and worship it as such, and at the same time, made 'em believe that this was the continual Faith and Practice of their Forefathers; if she did all this for many Ages, *without being detected* or oppos'd by any Church whatsoever, why might not *such a Lye* as the Forging of Scripture, be easily *concerted*, *without*

out being detected? You'll say perhaps, the *Romish* Imposture was *detected*, because it was oppos'd or rejected by some; and Sir, is that sufficient for a full Detection? If it be, then Scripture is but a mere Forgery, for in every Age it has been oppos'd and rejected, not only by some few Men, but also by whole Congregations: And this is more than can be said of *Popish Transubstantiation*.

3. *The Canon of the New Testament*, says he, *was establish'd upon Evidence, they proceeded wholly upon Evidence*, viz. *Whether such an Epistle was sent to* Corinth, &c. *who carefully kept the Originals, and sent Copies to other Churches; and by this Communication of the Churches one with another, the Scriptures were known.* But Sir, 1. What *Churches* were the *Gospels, the Acts, Hebrews, &c. sent to*, and *what Church kept carefully the Originals, and sent Copies of 'em to other Churches?* It was of greater consequence to know this, than it was to know *whether such and such an Epistle was sent to* Ephesus, &c. 2. When *an Epistle was sent to* Corinth, for Example, every Member of that Church did not know the Apostles Hand, and the few who knew it, might have been deceiv'd, and have taken a False Letter for a True one, for you allow 'em no Infallibility; now I wou'd fain know why the Church of *Christ* shou'd be bound, under Pain of Damnation, to believe those few Fallible Men, or take such an Epistle to be the Word of God, upon their bare Testimony? At least I see no *Evidence* here, which you pretend to so much. Case, *pag.* 53.

much. 3. Since this Method was so sure, and the Originals were extant, why was
Ca. p. 53. the Canon not settled in the First Age? Why were many Books of Scripture rejected by some, for 3 or 4 Ages? Was it by comparing them with the Originals they were afterwards receiv'd into the Canon? When, where, how, and by whom was this done? How happen'd so many Disputes concerning the Authors of many of those Books, the Time in which they were written, *&c.* 4. As the most part of the Disputes with the Ancient Hereticks, was about the Spuriousness and Genuiness of the Scriptures; if the Originals had been extant, the producing of 'em wou'd have ended the Dispute, without any more ado; yet this was never done, nor ever mention'd by the Fathers. 5. St. *Ignatius in Ep. ad* Philad. seems to be of a contrary opinion
Differta. 1. in *Iræn.* §. 38, 39. to yours; your Friend *Dodwell* is entirely against your *Evidence*; and *Eusebius* speaks of
Euseb. H. Eccl. l. v. cap. ult. the Followers of *Artemon*; he says they corrupted the Scriptures *then* receiv'd, but they did not produce *Forg'd* ones; and he has not one Word of the *first Originals* of the *Apostles*, nor says *that Hereticks were brought to this Test.* 6. But suppose the Originals were *then* extant, might not *Christians* have conspir'd to say they were divinely inspir'd; and if their Inspiration cannot be prov'd, they signifie nothing as to Religion: The Truth of the Facts contain'd in them, cannot prove they are divine, for True Facts may be mention'd in Uncanonical

cal Books; what then makes you believe 'em to be divine Scripture? Is it becauſe they were written by Apoſtles, or Apoſtolical Men? If ſo, then the Epiſtle of S. *Barnaby*, the *Paſtor of Hermas*, the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius*, *&c.* are Scripture, for your Learned Men do own they are genuine. If this be not the Reaſon, why are the Epiſtles of Saint *Paul*, the Goſpels of Saint *Luke* and Saint *Mark* receiv'd as Scripture? *&c.* Now ſuppoſe the Churches of *Corinth*, *Epheſus*, *&c.* did receive Letters from the Apoſtles, knew their Hands, could not be deceiv'd, *&c.* what ſignifies all that, if they cou'd not be ſure the Epiſtle was divinely inſpir'd, and fit to be a Rule of Faith? Pray Sir, tell us by what means they cou'd know this, and how you can pretend to *evidence* for what you call *Revelation*, ſince theſe Churches had none themſelves? —— Well Sir, I find you are not deſirous the *Deiſt* ſhould puzzle your Author any longer; at our next Meeting, I ſhall ſpeak again of this Matter; but remember, Sir, I have anſwer'd his Objections againſt the Infallibility of the Church, and notwithſtanding all that he has ſaid, ſhe remains ſtill in full Poſſeſſion of it. That alone is a compleat Anſwer to your Author's whole Book, for this is a Demonſtration; whatever the infallible Church condemns, is erroneous; but ſhe condemns what the Book contains of *Tranſubſtantiation*, Invocation, *&c.* therefore what the Book contains is erroneous and condemnable, *&c.* Sir, before we

part, I must take notice of a common Practice among you; Your petty Scribblers collect some Objections, which have been answer'd a hundred times; they add to these some silly Fancy of their own, they clap a Title to this *Farago*, and there's a Book publish'd against *Popery*. If no particular Answer is made to the trifling Pamphlet, then you cry out such a Book is unanswerable, *&c.* Now, Sir, is not this both unjust and ungenerous? You challenge us to answer your Books, and then, by grievous Penalties, you hinder us from answering your Challenge: But, Sir, since your People talk so much of Books not answer'd, *&c.* let them prevail with the Government to let us defend our selves, and then you'll see whether one Half Sheet Pamphlet shall appear in the World, without an Answer at its Heels. If you are not satisfy'd with this, I make you this Propofal; Take what Book of yours you please, pick out on't what Argument you please, and if I do not answer it to satisfaction, that Instant, I'll become one of yours; or if it be for your further satisfaction, I offer to meet, at any Time or Place, any Person of Honour and Learning, of your acquaintance, and discourse with him on the same Condition: Then you'll see how much your Author is mistaken, when he gives to some Books the Titles of *Unanswer'd* and *Unanswerable*, and I shall evidently prove that all the *Objections* worth any Notice, contain'd either in *Barrow's* Book of the *Pope's Supremacy*,

macy, or in *Cosin*'s Histories of the *Scripture* and *Transubstantiation*, or in the *Devotions* and the *Scepticism* of the *Church* of *Rome*, have been thorowly answer'd, many Years before the Author's of 'em were born. Sir, I believe you are a Man of Honour, and that you'll take no advantage against me from this Conference; however to prevent Mistakes, Misconstructions, Wrong Notions, *&c.* I make here the following Declarations.

1. *I declare that in this Conversation, I have spoken in my own Name; that I have undertaken it without the Order or Authority of any Person whatsoever; and that if I have said any indiscreet thing, it must be imputed* only *to my Imprudence.*

2. *I declare that my Intention neither was, nor is, to say any thing against the present Establishment in Church or State; and that when I speak of the Church of* England, *I mean the Nonjuring, not the* Revolution *Church of* England.

3. *I declare that if I've us'd any hard Words, it was not with any Design to insult your Author, whom I value for his many good Parts; but they have been extorted from me by the Violence of the Gout, by the Unfairness of his Dealings, and by the Zeal of True Religion: However I ask God's Pardon, the Church's Pardon, your Author's Pardon, if I have said any thing unbecoming a* Christian, *a* Catholick, *and a Gentleman.*

This,

This, Sir, is a Faithful Account of the Conference I have had with our *Popiſh* Friend, concerning the *Caſe ſtated*; in my next you ſhall have an ample Account of our next Converſation.

I am,

Sir,

Your true Friend,

and faithful Servant,

A. C.

FINIS.